# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 410 95 CE 001 977

TITLE An Assessment of Cultural and Linguistic Variables in Manpower and Vocational Skill Training Programs: Final Report and Summary.
INSTITUTION Olympus Research Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Manpower Development and Training.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 73
GRANT OEG-0-71-4777(335)
NOTE 476p.; Includes proceedings of the Conference on Cultural Linguistic Variables in Manpower Vocational Skills Training Programs (Washington, D.C., May 31-June 1, 1973); pagination is inconsistent, but document is complete

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$23.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Factors; Educational Disadvantagement; Instructional Programs; Job Training; *Language Skills; Manpower Development; Mexicans; *Minority Groups; Negroes; Questionnaires; Socioeconomic Influences; Sociolinguistics; Spanish Americans; Spanish Speaking; Statistical Data; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Appalachian Whites

ABSTRACT

The primary objectives of the study were: (1) to determine the extent to which cultural or language differences prevented members of the target group from profiting from vocational education and manpower training, and (2) to recommend remedies for any observed obstacles to successful training. Information was gathered primarily by questionnaire/interview surveys of administrative, support, and teaching staffs at manpower training centers. The minorities studied in the project were blacks, chicanos, native Americans, and Appalachian whites. Offering hypotheses about each specific minority group, the study concludes that cultural differences pose no significant obstacles. The final general hypotheses of the study is: Any effective assessment of the educational problems of minority members in training programs is not complete unless it considers the social, economic, and political realities of the trainees' environment. Two-thirds of the document consists of appendixes devoted to sample questionnaires, statistical summaries, and three related documents: (1) Perspectives on Black Manpower Vocational Development: Cultural Parameters. A Symposium, (2) Chicano Culture and Occupational Opportunity: A Panel Discussion, and (3) Proceedings of the Conference on Cultural Linguistic Variables in Manpower Vocational Skills Training Programs. (MW)

ED 095410

# AN ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC VARIABLES IN MANPOWER AND VOCATIONAL SKILL TRAINING PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

## Final Report

July 1, 1973

**Includes Proceedings of the Conference
on Cultural Linguistic Variables
in Manpower Vocational Skills Training Programs
— Washington, D.C., May 31 - June 1, 1973 —**

Olympus Research Corporation
955 East Ninth South
Salt Lake City, Utah

Prepared for the Division of Manpower Development and Training of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under grant no. OEG-0-71-4777(335).

CE 001 977

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED -- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the Division of Manpower Development and Training, like all other programs or activities receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with this law.

Opinions expressed in this document are those of the contractor and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

## CONTENTS

1 Summary of the Project and Its Findings

2 Introduction: Problems and Objectives

3 Description of the Project

4 Black Concerns

5 Chicano Concerns

6 Native American Concerns

7 Appalachian White Concerns

8 General Hypotheses

9 Recommendations

Bibliography

Appendices

A -- Sample Questionnaires
B -- Statistical Summaries
C -- Symposium: Perspectives on Black Manpower Development
D -- Panel Discussion: Chicano Culture and Occupational Opportunity

Proceedings of the Conference on Cultural Linguistic Variables in Manpower Vocational Skills Training Programs

## 1

# SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT AND ITS FINDINGS

Despite a decade of fluctuating efforts to spread the full benefits of America's affluence and opportunities to various population groups suffering more than their share of deprivation, the critical question remains unanswered: When unemployment, underemployment, and low incomes seem concentrated upon a particular group or individual, is the primary cause to be found in the shortcomings of those individuals or in the institutional structure of a society which denies them opportunity? If the cause is to be found in the individual -- lack of skills, lack of education, language deficiencies, undermotivation -- the operational response should be to change the individual. If the institutional structure is at fault -- discrimination, excessive credentialism, lack of information, transportation, etc. -- the answer is most likely to be found in changing institutions. Every remedy and every program must make some assumption about this dichotomy. If the assumption is incorrect, the solution chosen is unlikely to be successful.

In exploring for obstacles to economic success for various population groups, one obvious possibility is that cultural and language differences may pose serious obstacles. Those obstacles may be such as to make it difficult to function successfully in employment situations structured to fit the majority. The obstacles may merely deny one the opportunity to demonstrate performance because of employer bias or misconception. The obstacles may impede attainment of or performance on the job. Culture and language variables might also block the acquisition of skills necessary to obtain and perform on the job.

Seeking an assessment of the extent to which cultural and linguistic differences might prevent members of various minority groups from profiting from available manpower training programs, the Division of Manpower Development and Training in the U.S. Office of Education contracted with the Olympus Research Corporation for the project, of which this is the final report.

This project was initially a response to a problem that over the years has proved itself particularly resistant to solution: the consistently low level of success that members of minority groups have experienced as they move through the American educational establishment. There are those who argue that their chances of success could be improved if their educational program were carefully tailored to respond to the characteristics of their cultures which distinguish them from other cultural groups and from the mainstream of American life. Others argue that this very tailoring is discriminatory and that minority students and trainees should instead have experiences and opportunities identical to those that the majority have. Some minority spokesmen condemn both these positions as focusing on an insignificant problem -- these same culture and language variables -- and draining energy and attention away from the real source of the problem, which is not cultural at all, but rather the overall socioeconomic environment, the unrelenting pattern of deprivation that is the lot of so many members of America's racial and ethnic minorities.

The very fact that this problem arouses such controversy suggests that it is an important area for further exploration, and it is just such further exploration that is the task of this project. It is important to emphasize, however, the tentative nature of the project. The impact of cultural and language differences has been explored, but the controversy has not been laid to rest, and probably will not be by any formal research because it is fueled by the full range of human experience, by political, social, economic, psychological, philosophical, and even educational concerns. Nonetheless, this project has allowed the researchers to formulate some hypotheses about the role of culture and language in the manpower training experience of blacks, chicanos, native Americans, and Appalachian whites; and these hypotheses point to where new efforts can be more profitably focused.

## TERMINOLOGY

In order to make clear the description of this project and the rather complex concerns it addresses, it is helpful to define several of the terms which are used in the report:

(1) Culture: A body of customary beliefs and social forms and a related pattern of human behavior manifested in thought, speech, action, and artifact which combine to produce a distinct complex of characteristics that distinguish one population group from other groups

(2) Dominant culture: The culture (as defined above) manifested by the majority of the population in a given area, such as (for the purpose of this study) the United States

(3) Cultural and language variables: Those characteristics of attitude and behavior, use of languages other than English or use of nonstandard English, which are unique to a population group and help to distinguish it from other groups

(4) Minority group: A group comprised of a minority of the population of an area that is either distinct from the overall population due to cultural, language, or physical characteristics, or is separated from the overall population by attitudes of the dominant culture that assume such distinguishing characteristics

The population groups considered by this study are blacks (Afro-Americans), chicanos (Mexican-Americans), native Americans (Indians), and Appalachian whites.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objectives of the study were (1) to determine the extent to which cultural or language differences prevented members of the target groups from profiting from vocational education and manpower training and (2) to recommend remedies for any observed obstacles to successful training.

These objectives were approached through a series of distinct but related steps. First, an extensive review of the literature already produced about these variables was conducted. On the basis of this review, commonly held opinions about the variables in general and their effect on education in particular were gathered. From this information, a framework for further inquiry was devised, consisting primarily of a questionnaire/interview survey of administrative, support, and teaching staffs at manpower training centers. These personnel were asked to identify any cultural and language characteristics that they felt their trainees from a given minority shared and to assess the effect of those characteristics on trainee performance. An important and additional source of information was a variety of interviews with spokesmen of the different minorities studied, as well as three conferences organized by ORC -- one on chicano and another on black concerns and a third in which representative leaders from various minorities reviewed the draft report of the study.

## HYPOTHESES FORMULATED FROM THE STUDY

The findings of this study have been organized as a series of "hypotheses." The term normally suggests the setting up of an assertion which the study will then attempt to prove or disprove. However, this study is an earlier step in the process. It has explored the relevance and impact of cultural and language variables and then has documented the following findings, conclusions, and assertions which are deserving of further exploration and testing to determine the full implications of each of them on the training experiences of minority groups:

(1) Culture and language differences existing within various minority groups are often as pronounced as the differences among population groups, making it exceedingly difficult to reach generalizations about a given group that are sufficiently accurate to be a useful base for practicable recommendations. Nevertheless, there can be no analysis and no policy without generalization. It is necessary, therefore, to exercise care that

recommendations and policy actions address only those factors which are generalizable.

(2) No cultural attributes internal to and typical of the groups studied were discovered which posed general obstacles to the ability of trainees to learn and profit from vocational education and manpower training. However, misunderstandings by administrators and instructors about the nature and implications of their trainees' cultural backgrounds did occasionally impose obstacles to both teaching and learning.

(3) With blacks and Appalachian whites and many and probably most chicanos and native Americans, there are no language differences sufficient to create serious obstacles to the learning process in training programs. In all of these groups, English tends to be the dominant language. However, there are those in all of these groups who are inadequately skilled in English, and for them this deficiency is an obstacle. For many chicanos and native Americans, whose retention of their native language is generally more pronounced than in other groups, language tends to loom much larger as a significant factor in training.

That cultural differences pose no significant obstacles to the cognitive learning ability of minority group members, while language obstacles to learning exist only for those unable to understand and communicate in English without serious difficulty, does not mean that cultural and language differences cause no serious problems. Further examination of the data gathered in this study produces these additional hypotheses:

(1) Although it does not significantly interfere with a trainees' ability to learn, culture does function as a factor in various misunderstandings of minority trainees by instructors and other staff -- misunderstandings that can cause the teacher, and the learning environment he creates, to be ineffective. In other words, staff attitudes toward and perceptions of trainee characteristics are significantly greater obstacles to the learning process than are the characteristics themselves.

(2) The economic deprivation, the limitations on experience and opportunities, and the poverty-dominated social atmosphere shared in different forms by many members of the minorities encompassed by this study are much more likely to combine to create serious obstacles to successful training and well-developed vocational aspirations than are specific cultural and language variables.

(3) There are preferences for life-styles and location which dissuade some minority group members, particularly those from rural backgrounds, from taking full advantage of the economic opportunities provided by improved employability.

The implications of these last three hypotheses give rise to the final general hypothesis of the study: Any effective assessment of the educational problems of minority members in training programs is not complete unless it considers the social, economic, and political realities of the trainees' environment. Each of these hypotheses is discussed and supported in detail in chapter 8 of this report.

## HYPOTHESES ABOUT SPECIFIC MINORITY GROUPS

Behind the general hypotheses of the study are the specific hypotheses which were formulated about each of the groups studied. In the following discussions, these are spelled out in groups for further clarification.

### Blacks

There are no variables peculiar to blacks which pose significant obstacles to successful vocational training. Staff misconceptions that assume the existence of variables, which do not in fact exist, create an atmosphere of poor communications that hinders trainee performance and may also excessively limit the occupations to which trainees are assigned. Some blacks from rural backgrounds and central city ghettos do use nonstandard English which may cause them to be resented by training staffs and avoided by employers. Their ability to understand and communicate and learn is not impeded, but they do contribute to discrimination against themselves.

Most if not all of the factors which seem to affect the general performance of blacks in training programs are the result of past and present discrimination and the socioeconomic deprivation many of them have experienced in such areas as income, education, and housing. Blacks are particularly likely to reject training opportunities in what they perceive from a background of discrimination to be demeaning occupations.

### Chicanos

Those of Spanish background in the United States include descendants of the original inhabitants of the American Southwest with whom the Spanish conquistadores intermarried, immigrants from Spain, Mexico, other Latin-American countries, Cuba, and Puerto Rico and their descendants. The interviewees for this study were primarily located to the Southwest and excluded Cubans and Puerto Ricans and involved few Latin-

American immigrants from countries other than Mexico. The term "chicano" is used to encompass this heterogeneous group. The geographic, economic, and attudinal heterogeneity of the chicano population makes it particularly difficult to generalize about the influence of their culture, on their success in training, and on their vocational aspirations. Chicano spokesmen, nonetheless, strongly express a desire to develop, maintain, and utilize a sense of cultural identity.

Evidence from this study indicates that the extended family of the chicanos and the life-style and responsibilities that grow from it constitute a cultural characteristic that has a positive effect on the success of chicano trainees. Although the degree to which it exists is not clear, some chicanos are deficient in English language skills, and for them this lack presents a serious barrier to successful training. The ambiguous attitude of training staffs about possible solutions to this problem serve to aggravate the situation.

Several characteristics of the chicano population commonly described as culture based are, in fact, much more likely to be socioeconomically based:

(1) The allegedly negative influence that barrio life has on training success is in fact due to the qualities that barrio life shares with all economically deprived ghettos.

(2) The alleged preference of chicano workers for manual labor is in fact not a preference, but a choice forced upon them by the labor market and other socioeconomic forces that restrict their upward mobility.

(3) The alleged inability of the chicano to be motivated by anything other than immediate gratification (where it exists at all) is a reflection of

the poverty-based experience chicanos share with other minorities which makes any long-range planning a luxury.

The stereotype of the chicano as unable to make serious commitment to a time-structured situation -- the "mañana syndrome" -- is not apparent among these trainees.

## Native Americans

It is even more difficult to generalize about native American culture and language. The language of one tribe is often different from another, and few traits are widely shared among tribes. Language problems are a barrier to successful training and employment for many native Americans.

There are no cultural attributes which by themselves interfere with their ability to learn in training programs. However, many instructors fail to understand, or even to perceive, cultural attributes which are relevant to the learning situation. It is this lack of awareness that often results in teaching that is so ineffective that it jeopardizes the success of students subjected to it.

Two factors that contribute greatly to separating many native Americans from the mainstream of U.S. experience are the poverty and rural isolation that have consistently been the lot of so many. Although it is impossible to fully isolate the effect of poverty and isolation from the effect of culture, there is evidence to show that poverty and isolation are more likely to be the cause of some educational problems for native Americans than are cultural variables.

## Appalachian Whites

Cultural and linguistic differences do not significantly affect the training performance of Appalachian white trainees. The rural style of residence and life, close family ties, and the Appalachian dialect are identifiable characteristics in the lives of Appalachian white trainees. However, the first is a socioeconomically derived factor, and the study produced no clear-cut relationship between the other two and the level of trainee performance.

Training staff perceive a strong preference for training in manual skills among Appalachian trainees, but this seems more likely to be a response to economic and geographic realities than a cultural characteristic. Whatever differences exist (if any) between the performance of Appalachian trainees and some supposed national norm are the result not of culture or language, but of their economic environment.

# 2

# INTRODUCTION: PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES

The "war on poverty" that began in the early 1960s with considerable optimism has faltered in its drive to improve the lot of the disadvantaged in this country. At the same time that the problems of the disadvantaged have been revealing themselves to be considerably more complex than they were originally perceived to be, the capability of the government and of the remainder of society to help alleviate those problems is being called into question. A look at the current condition of manpower training programs for the disadvantaged -- the programs that are the focus of this study -- illustrates this shift from an atmosphere of confidence to one of conflict and questioning.

One challenge to the current status of training programs comes from the training population itself. Trainees from a variety of minority groups -- which provide by law a disproportionately large number of the trainees in such programs -- have challenged what they see as a paternalistic pattern in the structure of training programs. Increasingly, they are making demands for more information about the reasons behind the structure and content of these programs and for more decision-making power in the creation of the programs.

They criticize the programs on any number of bases, from the methods of funding determined in Washington to the alleged discrimination by an individual instructor or by the entire training system itself. One of their strongest demands is for training programs that result in "economic relevance" for the trainee. They often question whether the skills training they are receiving will make them really competitive in the specific job market they must enter when training is completed. Recently completed evaluations of training programs indicate that these trainees may have some grounds for questioning the relevance of their training.

It is unlikely in this new atmosphere that a program could succeed unless it is directly responsive to the desires and to the self-determined needs of its target population. This new awareness among the population groups that are more than proportionately represented in manpower training programs gives rise to the problem addressed by this study -- the role of cultural and language variables in manpower training programs. Minority groups themselves have concentrated on the cultural and language characteristics which distinguish them from others, which make them unique.

Another factor which converges with this concern among minority groups is the growing assertion that, in addition to the content of a training curriculum, the structure and functioning of a program contain a distinct set of attitudes about real, or imagined, differences between trainee life-styles and what is presumed to be a national norm. The trainee attack on program paternalism is a manifestation of this problem. This often unacknowledged set of attitudes creates a situation that has a significant effect on minority trainees, whether actual, relevent variables indeed exist.

These two factors, then -- developing self-awareness and increasing awareness of staff attitudes toward minority trainees embedded in programs -- have been at least partially responsible for the dual insistence by minority spokesmen on the following:

(1) Recognition by training programs of those actual cultural and language characteristics which they feel must be considered if a member of their group is to have optimum chances of success in training

(2) Identification and countering of the program attitudes described above which they see as a systematic pattern of subjective and distorted value judgment about certain characteristics of their respective groups

Such a pattern, they feel, severely hinders effective interaction between program staff and trainees.

Aside from the opinions of the trainees themselves, any number of assumptions about the relationship of cultural and language characteristics to the learning situation prevail in American education. An egalitarian position is taken by some educators who, under the heat of immediate political pressures and national mandates, absolutely refuse to recognize any essential functional differences in the learning styles of people. At the other end of the scale are some who demand that the slightest measurable difference in student cultural or language style be immediately and promptly accounted for in the educational milieu.

Given on the one hand this concern with cultural and language variables by educators and by minority spokesmen, and on the other hand the additional charge made by some of the latter that focus on these variables directs critical energy toward an insignificant problem and away from a far more important factor in the success of the learning experience: the socioeconomic environment from which the trainee comes, which permeates his activities and perceptions during training, and to which he returns after training -- it becomes important to inquire into the role that these variables actually play in the learning process of minority trainees.

It was from this complex network of concerns that the main objective of this study was determined, and it was primarily as a result of these concerns, as they became more and more apparent during the course of the study, that the main objective was modified and expanded to delineate an approach more likely to result in a useful assessment of the role of the variables in trainee experience.

As shown in the summary of the hypotheses of the study in the previous chapter, the researchers gathered more data than needed to identify relevant variables. In fact, those gathering the data had little choice in the matter. Many respondents criticized the focus of the study, and many also insisted on providing information about factors which they felt far exceeded the noted variables in their effect on the vocational aspirations and level of performance of minority trainees. Two major shifts in focus recommended by respondents have already been noted:

(1) To concentrate on the subjective, and often distorted, attitudes toward real or imagined variables embedded in the content, structure, and staff of training programs

(2) To focus attention not on the variables, the significance of which is slight, but rather on the socioeconomic deprivation and discrimination faced by members of minority groups which is far more damaging to their aspirations and performance

Further development of the objective resulted from a recognition that studies such as this take place in a social climate in which departure from, or nonparticipation in, the mainstream of American culture is usually looked down upon by the dominant majority. This attitude persists in the face of considerable evidence which shows that there are many structural devices in American society that prevent some groups from participating in the mainstream regardless of how strongly they may wish to do so.

No one is more aware of this than those who have suffered from it most. To question minorities on their differences is sometimes tantamount to assaulting them on the very spot they hurt most. They are keenly aware that many investigations of this sort are loaded with normative value judgments based on the patterns of the middle-class white. One minority person interviewed attacked the study on exactly these grounds: "You keep studying us to prove that we're different so you can say you're better than us. Hell, man, we're not different from you. You're different from us. How's that?"

On the other hand, some minority spokesmen not only endorse the notion of their own cultural differences, but go one step farther to stress the superiority of their culture to that of the general mass: "We're not only different, we're *super* different." Counterclaims of ethnic superiority are not new on the part of oppressed peoples, nor are they necessarily unfounded. They are merely cited here to illustrate the complex and sensitive field in which studies of this sort are undertaken.

Another factor that contributed to the further development of the original objective was the discovery that some respondents in the study were less concerned about the actual implications of the variables to the training world than they were about the social and political implications of such a venture. One black spokesman feared that even if evidence for the positive or negative impact of the variables in training situations could be gathered, such evidence would be used "to the further detriment of black people in an area that is economic and social -- not educational."

An interview with a local chicano community organizer in East Los Angeles provided the view that "just the recognition of our differences from Anglo culture provides him with the argument that we are inferior. But we have to argue from the base of our differentness to get quality education. We get it coming and going."

The fact that the hypotheses presented in this study go beyond the limitations imposed by the original objective is a recognition of the importance and, in many cases, the clear legitimacy of many of these concerns.

# 3

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Three of the minorities studied in this project were specified in the original contract: blacks, chicanos, and native Americans. These were logical choices for a study of the role of cultural and linguistic performance in training programs for the reasons discussed below.

### SELECTION OF NONDOMINANT POPULATION GROUPS

The four criteria for selecting the groups for this study are as follows:

(1) Each group contains a numerically substantial minority of this country's population.

(2) There is widespread (though by no means unanimous) agreement that each of these groups is a distinct and identifiable subgroup of the entire society.

(3) A relatively high percentage of the members of these groups is classified by the government as disadvantaged, and as such, are by law to provide a disproportionately large number of the trainees in the

programs which are the focus of this study.

(4) There is considerable concern expressed within each of these groups that they must develop a positive ethnic consciousness among their own members and must receive increased recognition of and respect for their particular groups by the dominant culture.

In the early stages of the study it was decided to include as one of the minority groups to be studied the grouping commonly designated as "rural Appalachian white." The first three reasons given above for the selection of aforementioned groups also apply to this group. As for the fourth reason, although this group is perhaps not as politically oriented or as pronounced as the ethnic conciousness of the other three groups, there is a pride expressed by many rural Appalachian whites in their culture and its manifestations (e.g., music, crafts, and so forth).

An additional reason for selection of this group is that, unlike the others in this study, rural Appalachian whites share obvious and visible commonalities with the mainstream culture in areas of color, lineage, religious patterns, etc., even though certain cultural and speech "differences" are attributed to them. Because of this difference between the rural Appalachian white group and the others in the study, it is included here to seek insights into the question of whether some of the "cultural differences" attributed to the ethnic or racial minorities (as influencing their level of performance in training and vocational aspirations) may in fact be more a result of subjective attitudes toward trainees induced by external and visible characteristics (such as color) than actual vocationally relevant behavior factors.

## DEFINITION OF CULTURE AND LANGUAGE VARIABLES

Culture could encompass the entire environment within which an individual lives. To have so defined the cultural variables would have deprived the study of meaning. Obviously a combination of factors in the environment, some personal and some institutional, causes members of some minority groups to have, on the average, a more difficult time competing in the job market than the total labor force. For purposes of this study therefore, culture is defined as already stated in Chapter 1. Culture is defined as a body of customary beliefs and social forms and a related pattern of human behavior manifested in thought, speech, action, and artifact which combine to produce a distinct complex of characteristics that distinguish one population group from other groups. Therefore, the cultural variables we are concerned with are those which are typical of a certain group but are internalized into the attitudes, responses, and life-styles of individual members of the groups. As an example, discriminatory practices of a majority against a minority might be part of the cultural millieu. However, for purposes of this study, the discriminatory tendency would be a cultural variable of the majority. Out of the common experience of being discriminated against, the minority will develop patterns of response which could become some of the cultural variables assessed in this study. As an additional example, if it were true as often alleged that Negro slavery enforced a matriarchal family pattern, the matriarchal family, not the slavery, would be the cultural variable with which this study would deal. Thus, alleged preference for cooperation rather than competitiveness among native American and "machismo" as the male role among those of Spanish backgrounds would be appropriate.

Our definition of language is more inclusive. It involves the problem of those for whom another language is their native tongue, whether learned in their childhood abroad or in homes in this country, and English as a second language. It involves any who have difficulty either understanding or being understood in oral or written English. It also involves those whose use of nonstandard English, even though it is their native language, makes communication difficult or who are discriminated against because of it.

As already noted, those definitions require differentiation between situations where differences in culture or language impede an individual's ability to learn in post-secondary manpower and vocational skills training and those in which the differences affect the instructor's attitude toward and understanding of the trainee and, therefore, the effectiveness of the teacher. The result may be similar, but the remedy may be very different, involving change in the trainee vs change in the instructor.

## SUMMARY OF THE METHODOLOGY

In order to accomplish the objectives of the study, the following specific steps have been taken:

(1) A staff was chosen, drawn from the racial and ethnic minorities to be studied, and was approved by the Office of Special Concerns and by the Division of Manpower Development and Training, U.S. Office of Education.

(2) A survey of the literature on the educational problems, the culture, and the language of each of the four groups studied was made to determine:

(a) What conclusions regarding the objectives of this study had already been drawn by authorities in various relevant areas.

(b) What the appropriate conceptual framework for pursuing the goals of this study should be.

(3) Within the framework derived from the survey of the literature, a questionnaire was designed, tested, and then used to survey administrators and instructors in vocational training programs regarding:

(a) The positive or negative influence of the culture and language of the minority trainees on their vocational outlook and levels of performance.

(b) The impact of the socioeconomic and political structures of the dominant culture on the vocational outlook and levels of performance of minority trainees.

(4) Social scientists and other spokesmen who are members of the groups covered by the study were then asked for their perceptions, ideas, and scientific theories regarding these same concerns (vocational outlook and level of performance in training of minorities). Symposia to accomplish this task were organized by the research analysts (for blacks and chicanos) involved in the study.

(5) Through a comparison of the data provided by the survey of the literature, of vocational centers, and of minority social scientists and spokesmen, the following actions were taken:

(a) Points of agreement and disagreement between these three sources were located.

(b) Characteristics that the target populations shared with one another and those that distinguished them from one another were identified.

(c) Hypotheses were formed regarding the effects of cultural and language variables on the vocational outlook and levels of performance of members of each of the four groups.

(d) Hypotheses were formed regarding other variables that appear to affect vocational outlook and levels of performance.

(e) Guidelines were drawn for possible courses of action based on these hypotheses.

(f) Some significant questions requiring further investigation were posed.

## LITERATURE SURVEY

The project research analysts scanned current literature pertaining to the culture, language background, history, and socioeconomic and political composition of the designated population groups. They supplemented their personal efforts with an Educational Resources Information Center search that had a similar focus. These searchers covered the following materials: magazines, periodicals, academic journals, books, doctoral and masters' theses, official government reports, other studies financed by the government or by private means, and descriptive and anecdotal material from sources such as black or chicano studies programs. The bibliography accompanying this report is but part of the literature reviewed. The objectives of these searches were: (1) to determine what conclusions regarding the project concerns were generally accepted by authorities, (2) to minimize the possibility of repeating work completed by other projects, (3) to identify and inventory works relevant to the concerns of the project, and (4) to provide the information from which a categorical and an operational framework for further research could be derived.

Two general observations grew out of the literature search. The search identified several focal points which were incorporated into categorical framework and refined to an operational framework on which further inquires, such as the questionnaire, were based. The general observations were:

(1) There are many references to culture and language variables as significant to a variety of educational concerns, but these references tend to assume the significance of the variables rather than proving it, and few of the studies relate the variables directly to contemporary occupational education concerns.

(2) Most of the literature is directed to the impact of such variables upon children and youth in elementary and high school. References to adult skills training are extremely sparse.

(3) Descriptive and anecdotal writings, however lacking in controlled objectivity, often contain more relevant information than more scientifically oriented writings. The latter seldom relate the variables directly to the educational concerns of this project.

Perhaps the major inferences to be drawn from these general observations are that inquiries into the nature of the variables have tended to be highly theoretical on the one hand and casually anecdotal on the other. They have not asked either of the most basic questions: Do the variables in truth exist in any significant way? How do they manifest themselves behaviorally in training situations? Nonetheless, the search uncovered a considerable amount of information that supported, clarified, and modified the data gathered later on in the questionnaire and interview survey in the field. This information has been incorporated into the findings with regard to each minority in the latter chapters of this report.

A more immediate benefit of the literature search was the focal points it identified, around which was built the framework for the development of the further inquiries of the study. Initially eight categories, or points of focus, were delineated:

(1) Linguistic variables: Concern was focused on the problems created by a dominant non-English language, by bilingualism, by a late introduction to English, and by minority attitudes toward the learning of the language of the dominant culture.

(2) Family structure: The type of family structure -- nuclear or extended -- was examined along with those interrelationships which internally and externally contribute to the social and personal growth of the individual.

(3) Basic philosophies: Some cultures have a particularly strong religious or philosophical base and react to outside influences with these beliefs in mind. The effect that this type of tradition has on the attitude of a culture toward educational processes was explored.

(4) Time sense and competition: Time factors and competition are particularly important to a highly urbanized and industrialized society. Questions such as the following were examined to determine their import for the specific concerns of the study: How do cultures that view time casually

reorient themselves to the temporal dictates of the dominant society? To what extent need they, or should they, engage in such reorientation? Should the value systems of the highly competitive dominant culture be incorporated into the value systems of the minority groups? If they should, what alternatives are there for improving the economic condition of the various minority groups?

(5) Distribution of power and role expectations: Role expectations of individuals in a culture and of their responsibilities to themselves, their family, and society are important in determining the division of labor and power. The question of how such varying expectations affect attitudes toward different kinds of education was asked to determine the significance of this cultural focal point to concerns of the study.

(6) Environmental consciousness: Urban or rural living conditions create differing attitudes which were explored. Rural societies, such as those of many native American tribes, have a strong tie to their land and to nature, a sense of belonging and a place to go home. Questions that were considered with regard to this point were: What significance does consciousness of this sort have (if any) for urban minorities that have strong group identities but no land base to which it can return? And what effect does this attitude have on group members in training programs?

(7) Self-concept: To establish and maintain a positive self-image is important to all people. This personal identity of the individual determines his behavior toward his culture and the rest of society. The question considered

here is: What effect do the identity problems faced by members of various minority groups have on their educational performance and vocational attitudes?

(8) Socioeconomic values: The study considered the extent to which the socioeconomic values of the minority groups were different from those of the dominant culture, and the effects of shifts in their value systems toward the value systems of the dominant culture.

These eight categories were broadly ranging areas of exploration, and much of the material gathered for them was of only peripheral value to the study. However, the process of examining them did help considerably to narrow the focus of the study to the kinds of questions that produced the specific findings of the study and also the specific operational framework on which the questionnaire and interview schedules were based.

The operational framework that follows was derived from the categories described above as well as from concerns expressed by respondents to a pilot questionnaire that was tested in the field for two weeks prior to the development of the final format. The questionnaire that was developed attempted to determine the extent to which manifestations of each of the following areas of cultural characteristics existed among minority trainees, and the effect that the characteristics that did exist had on training performance and vocational outlook:

(1) Family structure: Characteristics such as extended family, close family ties, family responsibilities

(2) Sex roles: Characteristics such as male dominance, female dominance

or subservience, clearly defined roles for the father and the mother

(3) Community structure: Characteristics such as style of residence and life, urban vs rural, a community-oriented sense of responsibility and motivation for achievement

(4) Individual, group, and community values: Characteristics such as attitudes toward time, toward competition, strength of religious beliefs and affiliations

(5) Language proficiency: Characteristics such as bilingualism and English deficiency

(6) Relation to dominant culture's socioeconomic and political structures: Such characteristics as resentment, perceived attitudes of the dominant culture, and actual effects of dominant culture pressures and discriminations

(7) Other variables attributed to the minority groups by the respondents

## QUESTIONNAIRE

A tentative questionnaire was developed from the findings of the literature search and was tested in the field. On the basis of reactions from those being interviewed and further refinement of the findings from the literature, the specific framework described above was delineated. From it a final instrument was derived which incorporated several features not in the pilot questionnaire, such as the list of cultural features and stereotypes, the grading scale described below, and questions regarding the influence of the dominant culture's socioeconomic and political structures on the vocational outlook and levels of performance of the target populations. The questionnaire served three primary purposes:

(1) It operationalized some relationships between the variable and the training situation.

(2) It provided a format for registering the perceptions of occupational administrators and instructors about these relationships.

(3) It offered a set of questions to elicit further information about project concerns from those involved in the actual delivery of training programs to trainees.

The basic questionnaire format was modified to produce distinct instruments for each of the four minorities surveyed. However, all of the questions gave the interviewers the ability to use the following instruments:

(1) A list of cultural features and stereotypes the respondent could check if he or she felt these were descriptive of the trainees with which he or she was working.

(2) Sections on each of the characteristics listed in the operational framework (described in the previous section of this chapter), and a grading scale on which the respondent could note the degree and type of influence he or she felt each characteristic had on various aspects of training. For example, questions were asked about the instructor's perception of the influence of family structure and values on such items as the trainee's willingness to enroll for training, his occupational preferences, attendance rate, dropout rate, etc. The respondent had the opportunity to scale most answers on a five-point

basis reflecting influence that was: "greatly positive," "moderately positive," "neutral," "moderately negative," or "greatly negative."

Although the specific procedures for the administration of the questionnaires varied according to the needs and problems encountered in surveying the staffs of the different training centers, there was a general pattern of administration that all of the researchers in the project began with, from which they could deviate as they saw fit.

Initial contacts were made with regional manpower administrators and state Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) or vocational education directors, who suggested the most appropriate centers in their respective areas for our interests. Contacts were then made by telephone, and follow-up letters were sent to the center directors, requesting appointment times and the selection of representative staff members. Preliminary information was included in the letter as to the nature and purpose of the project, and the relative importance of the samples to the overall project.

During the ensuing field visits, the questionnaire was distributed to participating center staff. The pattern of interviewing varied, of course, from center to center. Generally, however, the interviewer discussed the overall implications of the research with the center director, responded to questions, and then presented the questionnaires to the center staff, usually on a group basis. There was a brief introduction to the staff of the purpose of the research, followed by an explanation of the questionnaire.

Questionnaires were administered by researchers who were members of the minority that was the focus of the particular questionnaire. Great care was taken to assure the respondents that they had the freedom to answer any, all, or none of the questions, as they desired. In the case of some adverse reactions to the questionnaire format or to the whole process or focus of the study, care was taken by the interviewer to assure the respondents that expressions of negative as well as positive reactions to the process would be welcomed.

Although the basic format of the questionnaire was set up in such a way that it could be easily tabulated by a computer, respondents were encouraged to move beyond that basic format and include whatever anecdotal or "editorial" comments they felt might be relevant to the study. In all cases, the questionnaires were left with the respondents to be filled out and returned later.

## SAMPLING PROCEDURE FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The data sample for the questionnaire is reflective of several considerations:

(1) A research design decision that would give (within the framework of the time, travel, and other constraints of the study) the most effective available means for an initial assessment of the role of the variables in training programs was through a survey of the perceptions of staff working in those training programs (modified, of course, by the findings of the literature survey and the additional sources of information identified at the end of this chapter). Staff members have the most extensive contact with minority members actually in training programs and are thus a logical source from which to gather opinions on variables. In addition, the biases they might bring to such an assessment (as is

in the project hypotheses) are likely to be in themselves significant factors in affecting the level of trainee performance and vocational outlook.

(2) The choosing of programs where (a) the primary objective is vocational and manpower training, and (b) an appreciable percentage of the enrolled trainees is from one of the target populations.

(3) An attempt to sample each of the geographical areas where a significant number of members of the minorities studied could be found.

(4) An effort to get a full range of staff perceptions at each of the centers surveyed by interviewing, at each center, instructors, support staff, and administrators.

## The Sample for Blacks

Data regarding black trainees have been gathered from training center staffs where black enrollment constitutes the highest percentage. The average trainee population in these centers is: black, 63.96 percent; chicano, 7.91 percent; native Americans, 0.18 percent; and other, 27.75 percent. The respondents themselves represent diverse population groups. Of the national sample, 32.7 percent were black staff members, 61.4 percent were from other population groups, and 5.9 percent could not be identified by population group. An attempt was made to elicit a questionnaire from an administrator, a counselor, a curriculum specialist, and three instructors at each center. The results of that attempt give a distribution of responses as follows: 17.8 percent from administrators, 17.8 percent from counselors, 16.8 percent from curriculum specialists, 45 percent from instructors, and 2 percent from other positions.

Centers selected were located on the East Coast, in the Midwest, the Far West, and the South. A total of 101 questionnaires was elicited from MDTA and OIC staffs in these areas. If the test sites for the preliminary questionnaires are included, a total of 23 sites was visited: six in California; four in New Jersey; two each in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Connecticut; and one each in Florida, Georgia, Delaware, Indiana, Tennessee, Rhode Island. Centers were also visited in Oakland, California, and New York City, where the staffs refused to complete the questionnaire because of their objections to its focus, approach, and possible use.

A list of the centers visited, a copy of the questionnaire used to survey these respondents, and statistical summaries of their responses can all be found in the Appendices of this report.

## The Chicano Sample

The initial objective of this section of the study was to include the three main Spanish-surnamed groups in the United States: chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. The differences among these groups, however, made it impractical to lump them together. Consequently, it was decided to limit the study to the chicano group.

A total of 72 questionnaires was elicited from staff at approximately thirty Skills Centers and vocational centers in the Southwest that have a high percentage of chicano enrollees. A tentative questionnaire was administered at seven centers in Northern and Southern California. The final questionnaire was administered at five centers in Southern California, eight in Arizona, seven in northern New Mexico, and four in southern Texas. Colorado, although considered very important, could not be visited due to the limitations of time and funds. A list of the centers visited, along with a sample questionnaire and statistical summaries of staff responses, can also be found in the Appendices.

The centers surveyed in this section of the study are grouped in two different categories based on some specific features. Category A designates Skills Centers and vocational education institutions. This type of center is for the most part staffed and run by whites. Some exceptions occur in northern New Mexico. Another feature of those centers is that they enroll a variety of population groups. Category B designates Operation SER-MDTA, Operation SER-Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), CEP, OIC, and community centers staffed and run primarily by chicanos, and which have trainee populations who are also primarily chicano. The distinction between these two groups is made because it is one that distinguishes chicano training centers from those other minority groups, and because it points out some relevant contrasts in staff perceptions of trainee variables that are described in Chapter 5.

In category A, nineteen whites and thirteen chicanos were interviewed. Five of the chicanos and three of the whites were administrators. Three of the chicanos and one of the whites were counselors. Four of the whites were curriculum specialists. Five of the chicanos and seven of the whites were instructors.

There are two factors which must be taken into consideration when noting the high number of chicanos in this group: (1) the proportionately large representation of northern New Mexico centers in which chicanos are rather well represented, and (2) the tendency of the centers to assign chicano staff members to the task of filling out such forms as questionnaires that relate to their own population group. The California centers where the tentative questionnaire was administered, for example, did not have nearly so high a percentage of chicano staff.

The staff distribution in category B, on the other hand, better reflects the reasons given for its definition. Administrators were: eight chicanos, one white; counselors were: five chicanos, one white; curriculum specialists were: two chicanos, one white; instructors were: ten chicanos, four whites.

## The Native American Sample

A total of 55 questionnaires was collected at fourteen institutions which enroll native American trainees, five of which are in Arizona, four in New Mexico, two in Oklahoma, and one each in California, Colorado, and Wisconsin. A list of these centers is included in Appendix A.

Initially, the centers were selected because they met two criteria: (1) they provided vocational technical training, and (2) trainee enrollment included native Americans. Actual visits to designated centers revealed, however, that the percentage of trainees from the target population was quite low. Consequently, the field work pattern was modified to include such educational institutes as the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe and Bacon College in Oklahoma, where an appreciable percentage of the student population is native American.

## The Rural Appalachian White Sample

Three centers in West Virginia, four in North Carolina, four in Tennessee, two in southwest Virginia, two in Vermont, and one in Kentucky yielded a total of 67 questionnaires from staff working with rural Appalachian white trainees.

Of the sixteen survey centers, eleven were represented in the computerized analysis of the findings. The returns from the other four centers were not available to be included in the computer runoff, but are incorporated in the findings of this section of the study where they are particularly pertinent to the conclusions drawn from the computer. The percentage of respondents to the questionnaires in this sample includes: administrators, 16.7 percent; counselors, 4.9 percent; and instructors, 76.1 percent. The staff interviewed was 99 percent white, and the trainee population they worked with was 96 percent white.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The general findings which are discussed in the ensuing chapters should be qualified by the following limitations which, in most cases, are functions of the particular type of survey conducted:

(1) The data collected do not identify the degree to which differences in the structure of the training programs or variances in the manner of referral to these programs may have influenced the trainees' vocational outlook and level of achievement.

(2) The questionnaire was not sufficiently detailed to determine the degree to which the sex, age, and educational background of the trainees have influenced their vocational outlook and levels of performance.

(3) The interviewees were administrators and staff members at vocational training facilities. The sample was large enough to be representative of the staff at those particular centers and of staff in MDTA Skills Centers

serving those particular minorities. It is not representative of all post-secondary vocational skills training institutions. The data do not reflect the trainees' perceptions of themselves or of the program. also lack input from those agencies hiring the trainees after completion of their program.

(4) The range of sampling possibilities was restricted by economic and time constraints. Also, the selection of sites for visits was determined in concert with regional and state officials, making it difficult to ascertain which centers were actually representative of the training environment in the area and which were simply "showplaces."

(5) The operational framework and the questionnaire derived from it obviously run the risk of oversimplifying the extremely complex interrelationships of culture, language, and an individual's attitude and actions. The results of any survey, no matter how thorough, will of necessity be less than a full reflection of the rich interactions of culture, language, and individuals.

## OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION

In order to mitigate the limitations of the basic survey of the study and to add further dimensions to the findings, several steps were taken:

(1) As already noted, the specific information gathered from the literature survey was used to weigh the survey findings through comparison, criticism, and elaboration.

(2) A series of open-ended interviews with a variety of minority experts, spokesmen, educators, and training center personnel was conducted to

balance and elaborate on the survey data.

(3) During the field trips to the centers for the administration of the questionnaire, a great number of conversations about the impact of the variables on education occurred between the interviewers and respondents. Anecdotal records were made where these conversations fixed on points of interest to the study.

(4) Symposia were organized by the black and chicano research analysts to supplement the findings of the study.

A symposium, "Perspectives on Black Manpower Vocational Development: Cultural Parameters," was sponsored through the Afro-American Studies Department of Howard University in Washington, D.C. The panelists, all blacks and authorities in their respective fields of endeavor, included a political scientist-sociologist, an attorney, a linguist, an adult educator, an educator in urban education and career opportunity, and a community action administrator. Position papers by the participants can be found in Appendix C.

A symposium, "Chicano Culture and Occupational Opportunity," brought together six chicano professors from different California colleges. They included two sociologists, a political scientist, a historian, an economist, and a psychologist. A transcript of their panel discussion can be found in Appendix D.

After the draft report was completed, it was submitted for review to a panel representing major minority organizations. After the documents were read, they were assembled in a seminar setting to critique the report. The draft report was then modified in respect to some of their criticisms and identification of additional evidence.

Written Comments of these panelists and an edited transcript of the symposium discussions are contained in Appendix E.

# 4

# BLACK CONCERNS

The format for this chapter, as well as for the ensuing three chapters on the concerns of the other minorities in the study, will be a presentation of the hypotheses formulated from the findings of the study. Each hypothesis will also be explained in detail and the data which prompted its formulation will be provided.

## A. There are no cultural and language variables peculiar to blacks which pose significant obstacles to successful vocational training.

There was substantial agreement among both the writers encountered in the literature survey and the respondents to the questionnaires and interviews that cultural or language characteristics related to education distinguish blacks from members of the dominant culture. They found very little evidence either in studies that had been conducted or in their own observations that supported the existence of such characteristics. The few distinguishing characteristics that some felt existed were judged either to have no particular effect on training or to be other than cultural or linguistic in origins. In fact, this concern that the study was focused on an insignificant aspect of the problem was one of the strongest points insisted upon by all data sources. This attitude is summed up in the following comment by one of the staff members interviewed:

> Language is no real barrier in this training program and there are cultural differences among some blacks but not to the extent that socioeconomic and political factors play insignificant roles. There is no completely separate black culture that exists among the majority of blacks in the United States. Much of the customs, habits, and socioeconomic values of the United States are also values of the blacks.

Some of the literature surveyed seems to challenge this conclusion in that a great deal of it is directed toward preparing teachers to work with students expressing a different set of values from their own. The problem with these materials is that rather than attempting to demonstrate or prove the existence of educationally relevant variables, they tend to assume their existence as a working premise that teachers are not inclined to question.

The results of the questionnaire lend strong support to this first hypothesis. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to determine to what extent staff members of the training centers, who are in almost daily contact with black trainees, perceive their behavior to be aligned with popular stereotypes about them. The staff members were requested to indicate which of a list of 15 predetermined features they considered to be cultural features of their black trainees. The list included features of family structure, sex roles, community structure, individual and group values, language, and superstition.

The findings are presented in two categories: those responses made by black staff members and those made by nonblack staff. A majority of both categories felt that the popular stereotypes regarding blacks were completely inaccurate. There was also agreement between black and other interviewees about which of the items on the list they did perceive to be features of the trainees. Although there were some quantitative variations between the responses of the two categories of interviewees, both groups agreed substantially on all points.

Combining the findings of the questionnaire with information from the other sources used by the study results in a clear-cut and detailed support of the first hypothesis regarding black trainees; -- that of family; the second hypothesis, sex roles, and the third, community structure. All are vital to this study. The fourth and fifth factors, individual and group values and language, respectively, are also discussed below.

### Family

There were several categories which described various features which have been attributed to black families. To the category of extended family (close ties with members outside the parent-child nuclear family unit) 57.6 percent of the black interviewees responded that they did not perceive this to be a cultural feature of the trainees, while 51.6 percent of the other interviewees agreed with them. In other categories relating to the family, the respondents rejected them even more strongly. More than 60 percent of the black respondents and more than 71 percent of the others did not perceive any of the following to be cultural features of the trainees: close family ties and family interdependence, achievement for the family rather than for oneself, and father as head of the family.

## Sex Roles

Within this special category of family structure, 78 percent of the black respondents and 83 percent of the others did not perceive either male dominance or female subservience to be cultural features of the trainees. In this category, however, falls one of the two characteristics that the respondents felt was in fact a feature of the trainees' culture: 63.6 percent of the black interviewees and 71 percent of the others perceived the mother as center of spiritual and effective cohesiveness of family to be a characteristic of their trainees' families.

While this is substantial statistical support for this characteristic as actually functioning in the lives of trainees, that view should be qualified by at least two different arguments found in the literature that challenge the black "matriarchal" stereotype. Dr. Robert Hill, in a 1971 report for the National Urban League, challenged the image outright when he observed:

> Contrary to the widespread belief in the "matriarchy" among blacks, our findings reveal that most black families, whether low income or not, are characterized by an "equalitarian" [sic] pattern in which neither spouse dominates, but share the decision-making and the performance of expected tasks. . . . National earnings data do not support the popular conception that wives' earnings in most low-income black families are often greater than the husbands'. Recent Bureau of Labor statistics data indicate that in 85 percent of the black families with incomes under $3,000, the husband's earnings surpassed the wife's. Thus, contrary to the stereotypes of black men as "weak," "irresponsible," and "peripheral," the husband is the main provider

> in the overwhelming majority of black families, whether low-income or not. . . . Contrary to the belief that dependency is characteristic of most families headed by women, recent Census Bureau data indicate that two-thirds of the women heading black families work -- most of them full-time. Out study found that most assertions about widespread desertion in black families are not based on actual desertion rates. In fact, recent HEW data reveal that not even the majority of AFDC [Aid to Families with Dependent Children] families can be characterized as "deserted"; only one-fifth of the black families receiving AFDC in 1969 were so described.[1]

In their book, Grier and Cobbs take a different approach, pointing out that when a so-called matriarchal situation exists, it arises from a background that is considerably more complex than a simple cultural preference:

> The simplistic view of the black family as a matriarchy is an unfortunate theme repeated too often by scholars who should know better. If a man is stripped of his authority in the home by forces outside of that home, the woman must naturally assume the status of head of household. This is the safety factor inherent in a household which includes two adults, and it by no means suggests that the woman prefers it that way. If a woman is widowed she may assume many masculine functions.[2]

This is one facet of the recurring argument that black characteristics as well as black problems arise from situations that are more external and concrete than loosely defined cultural preferences.

---

[1] Robert B. Hill, "The Strengths of Black Families," National Urban League, August 1971.

[2] Price M. Cobbs and William H. Grier, Black Rage (New York: Bantam Books, 1969).

### Community Structure

The only other characteristics that questionnaire respondents identified as being manifested in their trainees' lives was a ghetto style of residence. Thus 72.7 percent of the black respondents and 72.6 of the others saw this as a significant feature. However, its significance is limited by the fact that life in the ghetto seems to be anything but freely chosen or dictated by cultural attitudes.

The late Lorraine Hansberry, a black writer, typifies the response of black spokesmen to the notion that life in the ghetto is by choice and due to the values of blacks: ". . . Blues or no blues, life roots or no life roots, Negroes of all classes have made it clear that they want the hell out of the ghetto just as fast as . . . anything . . . can thrust them." There seems to be resounding agreement that the ghetto is a harsh socioeconomic reality imposed on the blacks rather than something that they chose or that evolved out of their culture.

### Individual and Group Values

A series of characteristics that were listed under this heading was rejected by both groups of respondents as characteristic of their black trainees by percentages ranging from 57.6 to 84.8. These categories were: achievement oriented toward the community or the ethnic group, more cooperatively than competitively oriented, free of anxiety in their attitudes toward time, undependable in time-structured situations, strong religious feelings and affiliations, and superstitious in their beliefs.

## Language

Asked whether the category "monolingual speakers of a dialect" described their trainees, 57.6 percent of the black respondents and 74.2 percent of the others answered that it did not. Also, 81.8 percent of the blacks and 75.8 percent of the others did not perceive bilingualism (i.e., dialect/English) to be a feature of their trainees. It would seem, then, that language as well as culture does not function significantly as a variable affecting trainees' levels of performance and vocational outlook.

This conclusion is supported by the response of a black Skills Center administrator to an interview question about factors that have a negative effect on trainee performance:

> . . . Language also is not a factor. Sometimes it appears that many of the educational facilities from which trainees have come may be deficient in teaching him, in exposing him to the language skills necessary to perform adequately on the job, or adequately in an academic setting. However, when he is fully exposed and when he has the opportunity to learn, his language pattern is similar to that of anyone else's. I think this has been demonstrated time and time again, because if you notice those people who come out of the ghetto areas -- whatever ghetto really means -- and achieve by going to college and moving on in a successful way, you will notice that their language pattern readily adapts to those of their associates.

This is an elaboration of the attitude toward language as a distinguishing variable that was most often encountered in the interviews and in the comments added to questionnaires.

Another response to the question of language as a significant variable in the training of blacks is the observation made on different occasions by two of the participants in the symposium on black concerns sponsored by this project. Reginald Pearman, in his symposium report (see Appendix C), emphasized both the need to fully explore American linguistic patterns before assuming a definition of standard English and the need to preserve a pragmatic approach to the functional nature of language by encouraging the use of the particular form of the language that best accomplishes the specific task that the individual has before him.

Dr. Joseph Applegate, a black linguist, concurs in this emphasis on the intricate and complex quality of linguistic concerns and on the need to preserve a multipurpose image of language:

> In short, what I am suggesting is this: If a serious study of the speech of people in the black urban community is to be conducted, the methods that have been established for collecting data for sound linguistic descriptions must be used. First, let us have an accurate definition and description of the language called "standard American English" as it is currently spoken. This should include consideration of the language used by all speakers in the

American English speech community; no segment of the community should be arbitrarily excluded. Then, the descriptions should be as accurate and as complete as possible both for standard American English, for urban English, and for the speech of the black community. Only when these things have been done can we assume that we have established a firm base for discussion of urban speech patterns of the kind that we have heard this evening. Anything less implies that we are disregarding our responsibility as linguists and as scholars, perhaps succumbing to previously conceived ideas about the speech of certain ethnic groups.

On the basis of the responses to the questionnaire, the interviews, the symposium, and other materials gathered in this section of the study, there seems to be reasonably broad support for the first hypothesis about black trainees. There do not appear to be any cultural or language variables that substantially affect their level of performance in training or their vocational outlook.

However, in gathering this supporting material, the project staff discovered that there was a significantly widespread feeling that although cultural and language variables did not directly hinder the training experiences of blacks, there was one way in which they were indeed relevant to training. This discovery led to the second hypothesis of the study regarding black trainees.

B. Staff misconceptions that assume the existence of cultural and language variables that do not, in fact, exist create an atmosphere of poor communications that hinders trainee performance and may also excessively limit the occupations to which trainees are assigned.

Many staff members who were surveyed indicated an attitude of casual acceptance of black stereotypes. Some of them felt that trainees were not capable of being helped by training programs. A sampling of the statements which were made to justify this attitude includes:

"Most of these women can get welfare and don't really want a job."

"You know blacks don't like to work anyway. All they do is hustle from one training program to another."

"If they just knew how to communicate, they could learn faster."

"Their attendance is very poor for some reason. Maybe they don't care about training like other people."

These casually expressed attitudes on the part of some staff seem to run directly contrary to the material elicited from staff in support of the first hypothesis. Although when questioned about specific stereotypes, the staff tended substantially to reject them, the presence of comments such as those quoted above indicates that there may be a strong residue of the kind of vaguely hostile feelings that those stereotypes could generate that remains after the specific stereotype has been rejected.

Even in situations where there seems to be a genuine interest in optimizing the opportunities of black trainees, there is sometimes a determination to avoid challenging the kind of attitudes expressed above, as well as other stereotypes. This caution can often serve to freeze those attitudes at the status quo. The comments of one Skills Center administrator illustrate that type of dependency on the status quo:

> Once we had a major appliance course, but the business community said "No." They had to object to hiring them because if white women came to the door and saw that the repairman was black, they would throw their hands up and say, "Go away." They would not let them in. That was four years ago. But now there is a great need for people trained in this area, and they are hard to find, so nobody complains that we have such a course. These people are hired when they finish the course. Some have gone ahead of whites to general supervisors, where they have up-front offices and wear Brooks Brothers suits.

Another area where staff misconceptions may damage trainee performance and opportunities can be found in the fact that a majority of the questionnaire respondents perceived black trainees to show a preference for training in manual skills. This statistical judgment is challenged by several experts, as well as by many of the comments written on questionnaires. For example, the chairman of the Afro-American Studies Department at a major university noted during an interview that "It's impossible to speak of racial occupational preferences, except to say that the blacks desire as wide an occupational choice as is available. Like any other group, blacks tend to go where there is incentive and opportunity." This assertion reverses the implication of the questionnaire findings by implying that trainee choice of manual skills is not one that they make, but rather one that is imposed on them by a lack of other opportunities.

This view is also corroborated by the question raised by Dr. Clyde Berry, an Opportunities Industrialization Center executive and coordinator for the Institute for the Study of Multicultural Education at Riverside, California, when asked about the occupational preferences of black trainees. He observed rather pointedly that opportunities in present training areas are being automated out: "Are they trained for self-employment? Traditional training areas in manpower and vocational training should be replaced with career training in medicine, education, administration, etc., as they will never be replaced by automation. . . . These services will be needed in the black community now and forever." This rather tangential answer is clear in its implications. He does not feel the question of black occupational preferences is worth asking until there are some desirable alternatives available to prefer.

Many questionnaires contained comments such as the following: "Curriculum guides should plan for additional courses beyond the trades area. These should include some professional areas of opportunities." Comments such as this would not be made if the respondents' experiences with blacks indicated that they preferred only manual skills training. If as these illustrations suggest, there is no cultural preference for manual skills training, then the inaccurate perception of the majority of questionnaire respondents that such a preference does exist could severely limit the occupational outlook and training possibilities of trainees. There seems to be enough evidence, anyway, to warrant formulating this hypothesis as the basis for further inquiry into the effect of staff attitudes.

Although there do not seem to be any cultural or language variables affecting the performance of black trainees in training programs, there do appear to be misconceptions on the part of some staff about these variables that can have a negative effect on training. However, there are factors which seem to have considerably greater effect on training performance and vocational outlook than staff misperceptions. These factors were by far the most strongly emphasized by respondents during the gathering of data and resulted in the third hypothesis of the black section of the study.

C. Most, if not all of the factors which seem to affect the general performance of blacks in training programs are the result of past and present discrimination, and the socioeconomic deprivation many of them have experienced in such areas as income, education, and housing.

The deprivation that many black trainees faced as they grew up and still face during training creates some concrete and critical problems that, while they remain unsolved, have a definite effect on the training situation. Such basic concerns as income, food, health care, and housing, which may have all been at a survival level before training and which may still be at that level when training is completed, can occupy so much of the trainee's attention that focusing on his courses may seem a luxury for which he has little energy.

This same deprivation is reflected in the often extremely low quality of educational experience the trainee has had. The atmosphere both in the ghetto schools and in the ghetto itself is rarely supportive of a desire to achieve academically. In fact, the avenues to academic achievement are often cut off to the black student in his first few years in school through structures such as tracking systems. As a result of this kind of experience, his performance in training can be affected by both a lack of basic skills and a poor attitude toward educational activity in general.

One interviewer noted that at several of the training centers he visited, there was little or no public transportation available to and from the centers. Such specific, concrete, and external problems as this can result in drops in program attendance or other characteristics of low levels of performance. Another specific problem referred to by many respondents and interviewees was the lack of support for trainees who encountered legal problems during training. They asserted that a staff member who could act as a buffer between the trainees and local police (as well as the provision of legal assistance in court) would increase the rate of successful completion among black trainees.

The underlying assertion from which all of these problems arise is that there is a need to focus efforts and energy on the economic and social realities that the trainees face rather than on their cultural characteristics. Many respondents suggested that the most effective way to increase the level of trainee performance was to improve and broaden the range of support services provided for the trainees. The assumption in this recommendation is that, if he does not have to expend nearly all of his energy contending with the problems of his socioeconomic environment, he may be able to apply enough of that energy and attention to his course work to succeed in the program.

Equally as significant as the economic deprivation that black trainees experience is the pattern of discrimination that they face, particularly in the labor market. In fact, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was in direct response to this discrimination. Since the enactment of that law, many research studies have been conducted to disclose the extent to which such discriminatory practices continue among major industries throughout the nation. The results of these studies show findings of widespread continued patterns of discriminatory practices toward blacks by the industries studied. The findings of two of these reports, presented here, are representative of the findings in all the studies, and disclose patterns of discriminatory practices toward minority group members and toward blacks in particular, in both the private and the public sectors of the economy.

Discrimination in the private sector is illustrated by a study of the trucking industry sponsored by the Equal Opportunities Employment Commission in 1971. A summary of the discussion of the findings states:

> There is substantial evidence indicating that discrimination in the trucking industry is systematic in nature. The more important contributing factors discussed . . . are (1) the referral system of hiring, (2) reinforced by the biases of the predominantly Anglo-male rank and file, (3) combined with equivocal and unvalidated selection procedures and standards, (4) inequitable lines of progression, and (5) many prevalent employment practices which have been found in violation of Title VII. These elements are inherent aspects of the employment system and contribute to the discriminatory employment patterns which exist in the industry. This conclusion is consistent

with a major study of employment discrimination by the University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, which held that "nonability oriented and discriminatory personnel decisions are not idiosyncratically determined, but are both patterned and predictable."

The study on the status of equal opportunity in state and local government employment was done in 1969 by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. In a summary of its report, under the heading "Patterns of Minority Group Employment in State and Local Government," the Commission stated:

> The basic finding of this study is that state and local governments have failed to fulfill their obligation to assure equal job opportunity. In many localities, minority group members are denied access to responsible government jobs and often are totally excluded from employment except in the most menial capacities. In many areas of government, minority group members are excluded almost entirely from decisionmaking positions, and, even in those instances where they hold jobs carrying higher status, these jobs usually involve work only with the problems of minority groups and tend to limit contact largely to other minority group members. Examples include managerial and professional positions in human relations commissions or in welfare agencies.

This type of discrimination often produces the deprivation described earlier. The lack of employment and income inevitably results in inferior or no education, housing, and medical care. Though some few "window dressing" positions are provided for a minute percentage of blacks, the vast majority remain virtually at the bottom of the economic strata of this society, where they are either underemployed or unemployed. Many blacks continue to experience the nightmare of being denied a job at any level of employment.

Those "window dressing" positions are used in a concerted effort to show that the so-called "qualified " blacks are not discriminated against. Such positions have been made available to a few blacks, but in them, although they are conspicuous for obvious reasons, they exercise little or no authority.

Blacks dominate another unique position in the employment picture. They are the primary members of the group of workers that fall into the "last hired, first fired" category. A 1972 article in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, titled "Blacks, Chicanos Hit Hardest by Job Layoffs," states that blacks and chicanos "are bearing the brunt of layoffs as government departments and agencies move to meet President Nixon's 5 percent job-cut deadline of June 30. Federal officials explain that blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans are being hardest hit by the job layoffs because they are the last hired 'so now they are the first to be fired.'"

These various facets of job discrimination against blacks all find their roots in the traditional depiction of the blacks as occupying the lowest job categories that exist. To everyone but them, this was considered their place. For the majority, this "place" turned out to be jobs such as lawn boy, domestic servant, laundry worker, ditchdigger, garbage collector, delivery boy, elevator operator, orderly, busboy, janitor, locomotive fireman, and other jobs considered too demeaning to be filled by whites.

In the face of such extensive and long-standing discrimination arguments that the level and success of black occupational experiences are culturally motivated hold little weight. They are no more compelling than similar arguments made by slave owners that are recorded by Grier and Cobbs:

> The journals of slave owners tell of their exasperation when their slaves refused to work or worked poorly or broke farm tools. They attributed such behavior to "poor moral fiber," shiftlessness, and stupidity. One wonders who is stupid, the slave who dawdles or the owner who expected him to do otherwise.

This pattern of discrimination is actually defended and strengthened rather than attacked by the historical pattern of vocational education and even by some characteristics of MDTA training programs. Throughout most if not all of the southern and border states, there has existed a two-tiered vocational-technical educational system operated by the public schools. These institutions were the basis of racial discrimination for the masses who had to receive their education in public schools. In almost every public school jurisdiction there was at least one "vocational" or "technical" high school that was not open to black students. Those schools were regularly funded and equipped with the most modern machinery of the times. They offered full- and part-time courses in many of the occupational areas from which blacks were excluded. If a student other than a black was unable to attend college upon completing an academic high school curriculum, or if he simply chose to, he could enroll in one of these schools where he would be equipped with a trade upon completion.

For black children, there was no such training provided by public or private schools. The few private institutions that still exist are as they were in the past; they were poorly equipped, unaccredited, and too expensive for attendance by all but a meager few. In the public school system, instead of relevant vocational training, "manual training" or "workshop" was a part of the regular daily academic curriculum designed for "colored" or "Negro" children. Only an hour or two was spent in the shop each day by each child. The majority of children got to shop only once or twice a week, since just one schoolroom was provided for this purpose, and was additionally divided according to sex.

There was usually only one teacher for each shop, and he or she was responsible for teaching all of the "manual training" offered at a particular school. For the girls sewing, cooking, and laundry were offered in elementary school. In high school nursing was added to this list of courses offered in the shop. The nursing course often amounted to less than the Red Cross's present first-aid course. The boys had a choice of carpentry, chair weaving, and tailoring in elementary school. Auto mechanics and upholstering were added to that list in the high schools. In a few schools, mostly high schools, band and shoe repairing were offered. The band enrolled either sex.

It should be noted that the rural schools designated for attendance by black children were invariably named "county training schools" (e.g., Choctaw County Training School). The rural schools for others, however, were named for persons considered famous by members of that population group. Schools for blacks were said to have been closed during most of the regular school year so that the children could assist their parents in planting or harvesting the landlord's crops. Only in recent years has this practice been discontinued.

In addition to the hapless situations described in the preceding paragraphs, for many years academic high schools for blacks carried the "industrial" designation as part of their official names. So did many of the reformatory schools in which only black youngsters were incarcerated. There is no indication that this was ever the case for others; schools for them, other than academic, were either "vocational" or "technical."

Considering the consistency of the naming pattern, it is not likely that these dissimilarities occurred by accident. No remotedly industrial curriculum was used in the schools bearing this name, and courses were not available to blacks until they reached a higher grade level than that at which the same courses were offered to whites. This meant that if blacks were able to complete high school, they would not have been exposed to the same basic education as others.

Federal manpower training programs were developed, in part, in response to this pattern of educational discrimination. However, they ran into an immediate semantic problem growing out of the southern educational system just described. The word "training" is viewed unfavorably by blacks. For those from southern and border states, it reminds them of a background of discrimination and inferior conditions. While doing research for the cultural and linguistics project, interviewers found that respondents asked "Why do they have to call these students trainees?" In general these questioners felt that the answer was obvious. Those persons who set policy and plan programs seem to assume that blacks must be trained since they are deficient of the psychological capacity with which to think and make valid decisions for themselves.

Actually as well as semantically, the manpower training system contributed to the historical pattern of discrimination. During the early years of MDTA, there was no federal civil rights law to protect blacks. Segregation in the public schools was still being vigorously enforced. Then, as now, MDTA stressed that selecting and assigning trainees to courses in occupational areas which would meet the established needs of the business community be done by the local Employment Service. The Employment Service has a reputation for excluding blacks from policy-making positions of any consequences. As a result, the selective requests of employers for nonblack employees continued to be recognized and filled with the aid of MDTA.

In the South the Employment Service arranged for domestic and motel service courses to which only black females were assigned, and a service station attendant course to which only black males were assigned. A list of available courses, believed not to have included either of the three above, was circulated throughout the local and state service agencies without any patent indications that blacks were excluded from enrollment. In fact, the wording accompanying the lists and policy statements from central offices required agency workers to inform all recipients of the availability of training in the courses listed. Those interested were to be referred to the Employment Service by established referral forms on which were to be indicated the specific services the recipient was requesting. Blacks, upon returning from the Employment Service, stated that the courses in either domestic and motel services or service station attendant were closed. The recipients reported that if they insisted that the Employment Service "man" explain why they were not being informed about the courses of their interests, they were told that no such courses were available for their "race" or for "colored."

In other parts of the nation the situation took on characteristics that are now prevalent in much of the South since the enactment of a federal civil rights law prohibiting discriminatory practices toward blacks and other minority group members. This means that all federally funded programs such as MDTA must be fully open to all persons. Nonetheless, discrimination appears to be practiced at present in the patterns of selection and assignment to occupational areas. In many Skills Centers it was observed by questionnaire respondents and interviewees that only one or two blacks were assigned to courses where there was a high demand for graduates from these skills areas. This is especially true if the skills area was in a craft or trade from which blacks were traditionally excluded.

In courses traditionally considered occupational areas for blacks, only one or two, if any, nonblack students were assigned to them (e.g., food service and licensed vocational nurse). Skills Center staff who made the observations stated that they are not in accord with this assignment pattern practiced by Employment Service counselors. Some comments by staff members indicating their attitude toward the Employment Service trainee selection and assignment practices were written on survey questionnaires. One staff member wrote:

> In the recruitment of trainees, they should be given a greater understanding of the vocational choices and the extended choices available in each occupational field from which to choose. They should then be allowed freedom of vocational choice.

Another staff member wrote:

> I don't know whether the admission system can be classified as socioeconomic or a political system. I do know it stinks, and the people who can profit most in training are usually eliminated.

And a third staff member's perception is that

> While often due to factors in 5.3 [outside socioeconomic and political influences] a trainee settles for less than [his] innate ability might dictate. He in many cases is directed to occupational approaches where mobility is not more readily accessible. This raises the question as to whether society has the right to tell a man or woman he [or she] should not fulfill his [or her] potential, or whether society with this institution [the Employment Service] as its arm has the right to prescribe an occupation for him [or her] -- regardless of whether it is considered a beneficial type of nudge.

One reaction to this discrimination that blacks have encountered in their contacts with employers, with the general education system, and with vocational training programs in particular has been a tendency to reject training opportunities that they see as fitting into the pattern of discrimination. The particular sensitivity of blacks toward this type of "opportunity" gives rise to the fourth and final hypothesis which this study has formulated about black trainees.

D. Blacks are particularly likely to reject training opportunities in what they perceive from a background of discrimination to be demeaning occupations.

Few if any persons in the white community realize that each generation of black parents shared with their children the profound resentment they held for the only jobs they could get. The children were forever reminded that they should attain a socioeconomic level higher than that of their parents. They were to "get a good education" in order to have "a good life like other people." They were counseled that good positions for which they had prepared themselves might not be immediately available, but the day would come when they would be. These children were to remember the disdain their parents expressed toward manual labor. They were to strive to attain positions equal with all others. Regardless of the prevailing belief outside their communities, black educators and ministers were reinforcing the counseling of the children's parents. Such counseling continues to this day.

Consequently, blacks as a whole view the kinds of employment they have been traditionally limited to and training for such employment as demeaning both to them as individuals and to blacks as a group.

Being exposed to black awareness programs, minority history, black journalism and mass media, blacks are now more aware of the many opportunities in education, employment, housing, and so forth which are potentially available to them. With a federal civil rights law that promises redress for prohibited practices against them, they are more likely to reject training opportunities in what they perceive, from their background of discrimination, to be demeaning occupations (regardless of the attractiveness of the job title).

An example of the black trainees' attitudes toward training opportunities for menial occupations is indicated by the statement of a southern Skills Center administrator. He said candidly that

> Blacks do not want "small motor repair." They consider it will end up being lawn boy preparation which they see as just the same old thing.

Something they could do without training. We had to re-do it and change it to "small and marine motor outboard repair" when they took to it. They were hired because there was a need for qualified people. They don't want this "hands on" stuff. They want to sit behind desks but, the "hands on" stuff is all the program offers.

In one Center the administrator complained because the drafting course had been discontinued "on a temporary basis. But for more than a year Employment Service had not assigned any trainees to the course." This administrator suggested, as an illustration of where the program's focus lay, a tour through an elaborate mock home built in the Center to be used for training in domestic services. This facsimile was complete with thick expensive carpeting and superbly appointed furniture. The kitchen was equipped with all of the modern conveniences, including an electric dishwasher and garbage disposal. Nothing else in the Center appeared to have received nearly the excellent consideration in planning and construction that this training aid did.

Shortly after the first class began in the domestic service course, persons superior to him or from the Employment Service assigned trainees to work in homes in the white community for the purpose of "practical experience," he said. The director indicated this course was considered demeaning to the trainees and infuriated them. Trainees assigned to the course dropped out, and new ones refused to accept assignment to the course, it was reported. This type of emphasis in program content is certainly a greater factor in the poor performance of black students in manpower and vocational training than is their culture and language.

Some courses are offered under sophisticated titles such as "licensed vocational nurse." However, when a training center director explained the duties of this skill, they amounted to no more than the responsibilities of a hospital orderly. Yet the director and Employment Service counselor stated that they were unable to understand why no trainee applicants have accepted assignment to this course.

Another facet of this attitude is black response to training opportunities in the crafts and trades areas from which they have been traditionally excluded. The length of the training cycles in these areas are questioned with regard to whether they are long enough for adequate preparation for the trainees to enter a craft or trade, either as an apprentice or journeyman, or are just long enough to prepare them to enter as "helpers." Many trainees realize their fathers occupied jobs as "helpers" in crafts and trades without training. Whenever this is considered to be the case, they are likely to reject such training opportunities.

The findings of this research indicate a national consistency in the attitude of blacks toward training in manual and menial occupational areas. A Skills Center director in California stated quite simply that

> . . . [T]he students prefer nonmanual types of training to manual. They have attached stigmas to laundry and dry cleaning and other hands-on type of training and jobs, even though the demand for employees in these areas is greater than the supply would be if they could find the trainees. They prefer business, clerical, and office types of endeavors at less pay than manual types.

An additional factor that is more likely to have an effect on the level of performance of trainees than cultural and language factors is the overall structure of the training programs themselves. The findings of this study indicate that the attitudes and policies imposed upon the training centers or those which these institutions construct themselves are felt by respondents to be more significant barriers to trainee success than their culture and language. In most training centers the method of screening and selecting trainees is considered inadequate. Neither the center nor the staff members have the opportunity to assist in the selection and course assignments of the trainees. This often results in the selection and assignment of trainees for course offerings that are not related to their occupational preferences or need.

The general practice of the Employment Service counselors is to assign the trainees to "slots" wherever there are openings, according to training center staff members. As an alternative to such assignments, applicants for training are placed on a waiting list. In many instances the waiting period ranges from three months to two years. Even if the trainees are eventually admitted, they may enter with negative feelings toward the center which they think has kept them out. This arbitrary screening process produces an attitude on the part of the trainees and staff members which is not conducive to learning. It was emphatically suggested by staff members that this policy be replaced by a more tenable arrangement.

Uncertainty of funding was also a major concern of staff members. They felt that this frustrated whatever positive efforts they tried to make, leaving both staff and trainees with negative feelings about the possibility of a successful program. It was the expressed desire of most staff members that these programs be funded on a more permanent basis in order to minimize disruptive effects in the teaching-learning process.

Some other policies of MDTA-type training centers reported by many interviewees to adversely affect black trainee performance and success are:

(1) Hiring an unreasonably small percentage of black staff members at centers where most of the trainees are from that population group

(2) Inadequately recognizing events and rituals considered important to the black trainee population (e. g., Martin Luther King's birthday, display of the black liberation flag), while on the other hand, consistently celebrating events considered important by other trainees at the same centers (e. g., George Washington's birthday, Labor Day, etc.)

(3) Providing little or no literature or training manuals depicting black models

(4) Excluding minority history in course offerings

(5) Not establishing channels for relevant program input by black trainees and members of the black community

These views represent what the interviewees considered the more flagrant examples of policy misalignment that directly affect the trainees during their enrollment in vocational education and manpower training programs. It is the perception of the majority of the interviewees that these policies and practices, whatever their origin might be, play a more important role in a negative manner than the trainees' culture and language regarding their willingness to enroll for training and their performance and success during training.

A vast majority of the respondents and interviewees agree that the crucial variable in any aspect of the black experience in this country is not one of culture or language -- it is, quite simply, color. Whitney Young, the late executive director of the National Urban League, put it this way:

> The other unique factor is that the Negro, once here, even if he somehow acquired a sufficient amount of affluence to escape, could not escape because of his color. Members of religious or national groups can change their affiliations and then even run for President. They can change and get lost in the larger society. But color has a note of finality; the Negro is unable to get lost.

All of these factors, then -- the economic deprivation that the trainee faces, the racial discrimination that surrounds him in every area that he enters, the structure of his training programs, the lack of supportive services and, perhaps most of all, color -- combine to overwhelm factors of culture and language in the question of relative influence on the level of performance and vocational outlook of black trainees.

## 5

## CHICANO CONCERNS

Like the blacks, chicanos seem convinced that social and economic factors overshadow culture and language as the causes of problems in skill training. Those who were interviewed felt that many of the characteristics that are attributed to their culture are in truth derived from their socioeconomic predicament, which is neither cultural in origin nor completely characteristic or unique to the chicano. However, the tendency to reject culture and language as factors is not nearly so clear-cut among chicano respondents as among blacks. Chicano spokesmen, as well as many questionnaire respondents, took great pains to reject sweeping generalizations about the nature and significance of their culture and language. Nonetheless, they agree that they are part of a distinct culture and that there are certain specific characteristics of that culture which may be important to training programs. Moreover, they are deeply concerned that their culture, which they see as threatened with extinction through assimilation into the American dominant culture, be preserved and strengthened.

In addition to their cultural concerns, chicano respondents felt that there were language problems that interfered with the performance of some chicanos in training.

Language was also seen as a crucial element in the preservation of the chicano culture, and partially because of this perspective, considerable emphasis was placed upon solving the dilemma that seems to surround the issue of bilingual training. This focus on chicano culture and language is tempered, however, both by the socioeconomic influences noted above and by the high degree of heterogeneity that makes any generalizing about the chicano of questionable value.

### A. The geographic, economic, and attitudinal heterogeneity of the chicano population makes it particularly difficult to generalize about the influence of their culture and language on their performance in training and on their vocational aspirations.

An immediate example of this heterogeneity is the confusion that sometimes arises over the use of the labels "Mexican-American" and "chicano." It seems from the evidence gathered in this report that "chicano" is preferred by those more strongly and openly assertive of their ethnic and cultural identity and more directly and aggressively involved in the chicano movement. "Mexican-American" on the other hand seems to be preferred by those who, although they hold similar ideals and goals, express them and go after them in more indirect and conventional ways. The term "chicano" is used in this report for simplicity, not to take sides in any such differentiation.

Chicano writers strongly insist on their diversity and may constitute one of the most heterogeneous ethnic groups ever to be studied by sociologists. With reference to the scholarly study of the chicano, we would be well advised to stop trying to find the "typical" or "true" and seek rather to establish the range of variation.

Generalizations extrapolated from the community in which a chicano writer happened to grow up, or which a white sociologist or anthropologist happened to have studied, can be particularly misleading. The nature and roots of this diversity take many forms -- they can be: (1) subjective or internal (individual or group self-image, personal involvement or lack of it in the social and political aspirations of the chicano minority, etc.), (2) objective or external (environmental setting: urban, rural; regional setting: California, Texas, New Mexico; distance from the Mexican border), or (3) a mixture of both.

With regard to the internal type of source for diversity, the chicano writer Penalosa hypothesizes that the extent to which chicanos conceive of themselves as belonging to a separate ethnic group would probably fall along a continuum of spectrum of which three main segments can be identified: those at the extremes and those at the center. He writes,

> At one extreme are those who acknowledge the fact of their Mexican descent but for whom this fact constitutes neither a particularly positive nor a particularly negative value, because it plays a very unimportant part in their lives and their self-conception. At or near the middle of this putative continuum are those for whom being of Mexican ancestry is something of which they are constantly conscious and which looms importantly as part of their self-conception. Their Mexican descent may constitute for them a positive value, a negative value, or more generally an ambiguous blend of the two. At the other end of the continuum are those who are not only acutely aware of their Mexican identity and descent but are committed to the defense of

Mexican-American subcultural values, and strive to work actively for the betterment of their people.[1]

An example of the external basis for diversity is the model offered by Drs. Ramirez and Castaneda, in which they see three types of chicano communities that they classify as traditional, dualistic, and atraditional. They define these types of communities as:

(1) In traditional communities, forces which push chicanos to develop their value systems in line with either Mexican rural or urban values tend to predominate. These communities are generally rural and are located near the Mexican border. Chicanos usually comprise the majority of the population in these communities. Traditional communities are most likely to be found in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, the inland valleys of California (such as San Joaquin and Coachella), and the border areas of California, Texas, and New Mexico.

(2) Forces to incorporate values of the mainstream American middle class tend to predominate in dualistic communities, but the other two forces are also present in considerable strength. In general, the more middle-class chicanos in these communities show more evidence of incorporation of values of the mainstream American middle class, while lower

---

[1] Fernando Penalosa, "Chicano Multilingualism and Multiplossia" (Long Beach, California: Department of Sociology, California State College, 1971), unpublished paper.

class chicanos exhibit values which are more typical of chicanos of traditional communities. These communities are generally semi-urban, and are usually a good distance from the Mexican border. Chicanos are usually in the minority in these communities, which can be found in cities located in the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area (Riverside, San Bernardino, etc.), and in the San Francisco Bay area (San Jose). They also constitute subareas of major cities in the Southwest and Midwest.

(3) In atraditional communities, forces to incorporate values of the mainstream American middle class clearly predominate over all others. Values of most chicanos in these communities are more nearly similar to those of the mainstream American middle class in that community than they are to those found in the traditional chicano community. For the most part, these communities are urban in character and are located at a considerable distance from the Mexican border. Chicanos usually constitute a very small percentage of the population in these communities, with most of the population being composes of members of the mainstream American middle class. Atraditional communities can be found in cities located within the Los Angeles metropolitan area (examples Monterey Park and Montebello) and also in suburban areas of other large cities in the Southwest and Midwest, such as Albuquerque, San Antonio, Houston, Phoenix, Denver, and Chicago.

Deluvina Hernandez identifies a series of dissimilarities in the various chicano action groups which might be pertinent to consider here as another argument for the heterogeneity of this minority: (1) varying interpretations of the concept "liberation of La Raza" (e.g., to what extent will there be liberation through assimilation, or liberation through local chicano community control, or liberation through rejection of white association), (3) variation in identification of goals (e.g., upward mobility through joining the "system," upward mobility through changing the "system," upward mobility through bypassing the "system"), (4) variation in degree of activism or militarism, (5) conceptualization of chicano ethnic identity, (6) variation in number and degree of cultural or ethnic characteristics manifested, (7) variation in methods used in achieving specified goals (e.g., extent of rejection of anything white, extent of acceptance of white inputs, extent of inclination toward communication with whites, extent of reaction to white action). All of these differences add to the heterogeneity of the numerous segments which comprise the chicano group's efforts to achieve self-development and autonomy; they determine the degree to which the achieved results differ as well.

A situation that intensifies the heterogeneity of the chicano culture -- but which at the same time delineates a unique characteristic of that culture -- is the high level of change and dynamism that infuses the experience of the chicano. Rendon claims that the chicano community is undergoing one of the most rapid periods of change of any people of the Americas.[2] The particular nature of this dynamism of of the chicano experience is that it is constantly incorporating changes taking place in the two home areas of the chicano population: Mexico and the United States. It is a culture with a continuous and inexhaustible sequence of first and second generations which will only stop when, or if, the border is closed.

---

[2] Armando Rendon, Chicano Manifesto (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1971).

It seems clear from such arguments that there is no room in an analysis of chicano culture for casual or sweeping generalizations. Perhaps the primary implication of all this evidence of heterogeneity is that any conclusions about influences on chicano trainees must, if they are to be of any use whatsoever, be formed about a much more specifically and concretely defined group than the whole universe of chicano trainees. Not only must the vast variations within the culture be taken into account, but the analyst must also look at the variations in trainees' language abilities and at the vast array of social and economic factors that will sometimes serve as much to distinguish trainees one from the other as to lump them together into a uniform socioeconomic group. Any analyst, then, is cautioned to be as specific as possible in his approach to chicano trainees and their problems in training.

### B. Chicano spokesmen strongly express a desire to develop, maintain, and use a sense of cultural identity.

Although they are concerned that generalizations be treated with sufficient skepticism, chicano spokesmen strongly emphasize the existence of a distinct chicano culture. They see their culture as facing a crisis of existence. One of the panelists in the chicano discussion sponsored by this study asserted that, with regard to the heavy pressure on the chicano to let himself be assimilated into the dominant American culture, he is faced with the choice of continued deprivation and discrimination, a kind of "colonization" or "cultural genocide." He must either suffer because of his culture or abandon it. It is in the face of this crisis that chicano spokesmen urge a vigorous defense of their culture. Another panelist asserted that a more productive attitude by the dominant culture could bring a solution to chicano "problems." He remarked that rather than to stress an acculturation and assimilation of a people, whites should accept them as they are, "with the built-in positive coping mechanisms" that are in a group of people such as chicanos, and then the whites "should reinforce" these.

One method that chicano spokesmen employ on their own to improve the health of the cultural image of the chicano is to provide an assessment of the conclusions about their culture drawn by dominant culture "authorities." For example, one writer, in a criticism of the views expressed by white social studies, said that

> . . . contemporary social science views of Mexican-Americans are precisely those held by people during the days of the American frontier. In short, there has not been any significant change in views toward Mexican-Americans for the past 100 years. . . . What we have, instead, are contemporary social scientists busily perpetuating the very same opinions of Mexican culture that were current during the Mexican-American wars. These opinions were, and are, pernicious, vicious, misleading, degrading, and brainwashing in that they obliterate history and then re-write it in such a way as to eliminate the historical significance of Mexican-Americans, as well as to simultaneously

question the legitimacy of their presence in contemporary society.[3]

A most ambitious and sophisticated product of white social studies on chicanos is "The Mexican People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority," done at the University of California, Los Angeles, through a Ford Foundation grant supplemented by a grant from the college examination board. Despite the fact that the study took seven years and cost more than $400,000 -- was a modern and exhaustive look at the chicano scene -- conspicuously showed the well-known chicano as co-author -- recognized the rather obvious reality that the chicano is mostly urban, highly bilingual, and extremely heterogeneous, it was heavily criticized by chicano writers.

Another approach to the development of a healthy chicano self-image is the simple and oft-repeated assertion by chicano spokesmen that their culture does in fact exist. The following statement by another chicano writer reflects emphatically where a chicano majority stands on the issue of their culture.

> There is no doubt in my mind that we Chicanos as a group comprise a culture, that in our functional exercise of culture we constitute a community, or several communities, that as individuals we perform our social roles according to the influences of this culture and the efficacy of this community, and that Chicano culture, Chicano community, and Chicano rule are distinct, unique, and American.[4]

---

[3] Octavio I. Romano, "The Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican-American: The Distortion of Mexican-American History," El Grito (Fall 1968), vol. II, no. 1.

[4] Jaime Sena Rivera, "Chicanos' Culture, Community Role -- Problems of Evidence and a Proposition of Norms toward Establishing Evidence," Aztlan (Spring 1970).

And today's chicano movement, aside from its social and political goals, has all the features of a cultural activism and revival. Hernández writes, "The Movement is a concept that is many things to many people, but to all it is *the perpetuation of cultural* and ethnic identity, and the betterment of social, economic and political conditions for Mexican people in the United States."[5]

It is within the framework of this general concern of chicano culture that both spokesmen and questionnaire respondents have identified specific cultural and language areas that they feel may affect the performance of chicano trainees.

C. *It is generally accepted that the extended family of the chicano, and the life-style and responsibilities that grow from these, constitute a cultural characteristic that has a positive effect on the success of chicano trainees.*

A substantial majority -- 77.3 percent -- of the respondents to the questionnaire agreed that the extended family is a characteristic of the chicano trainees with whom they were working. There is also considerable reference in the literature to the extended family as a common element of chicano life. The moderator of the chicano panel discussion describes the extended family (*familia*) as a tight group of nuclear families, living in close proximity, who engage in considerable social interaction. Chicanos see the high degree of interaction, and the sense of interresponsibility that goes with it, to be the factor that distinguishes their family experience from that of nonchicanos.

---

[5] Deluvina Hernández, "La Raza Satellite System," *Aztlan* (Spring 1970). Emphasis in the original.

This characteristic of extended family holds significance for training in the area of motivation. The closer the trainee is to being a member of, or the product of an extended family, the greater the need to encourage him not by appealing to him as an individual, but by contributing to the family.

Ramirez, Price-Williams, and Beman, a team of sociologists, have found evidence of this need in fourth grade children. They administered a picture stories test (i.e., they asked the children to tell stories to accompany pictures of educational scenes that were shown) to chicano and white fourth grade children. The stories were first scored by using the traditional need-achievement scoring system developed by McClelland (as modified by Riccucitti and Clark, 1965), and scored a second time by using a scoring system for achievement for the family which was developed by the investigators. The results showed that there were no significant differences between the two groups when the traditional need-achievement scoring system was used but that chicanos scored significantly higher when the achievement for the family scoring system was employed. This achievement motivation has usually not been understood by either social scientists or educators, thus frequently leading them to the conclusion that chicanos are not achievement oriented. This has been further complicated by the fact that schools have usually not made an attempt to involve chicano parents or other family members in the educational process, thus making it difficult for the chicano child to exercise this unique motivational orientation.

Dr. David Lopez-Lee et al., in a study of chicano students just completed at California State College in Los Angeles, demonstrates the same thing: The sense of achievement for the family motivates chicano college students more strongly than it does white college students.[6]

There is a commonly held stereotype of the extended family, which is seen as having a negative effect on trainee performance because it puts so many demands on the trainee beyond those of self-improvement that he is unable to effectively do his work. The results of the questionnaire reject that stereotype. Respondents felt that the extended family had a positive effect on the willingness of the trainees to enroll in the program; the trainees' occupational preferences; their relationship with administrators, counselors and instructors; their relationship with fellow trainees; and their socioeconomic values. The only negative influence that the family was perceived as having was a slight one on the dropout rate.

One result of such a strong sense of family is a tendency toward a cooperative, rather than a competitive approach to activity. At least two of the participants in the panel discussion emphasize this cooperative focus. The focus could be significant to the training situation because if it was not understood by instructors, they might well interpret the lack of response to their conventional, competition-based attempts at motivation as laziness, lack of interest, stupidity, or any other educationally pejorative quality.

### Machismo

One element of the chicano family experience that may at times work against this cooperative attitude, and which may also have significance in the training situation, is the characteristic often casually referred to as "machismo." Chicano scholars agree that this quality does exist, and they are supported in that opinion by the respondents to the questionnaire who felt rather strongly that male dominance was a characteristic of chicano families. Spokesmen are quick to note, however, that machismo is an extremely complex and often misunderstood characteristic that should not be used as a catch-all explanation for chicano family problems. Montiel, in a broad critical review of the writings on the Mexican and chicano families by both Mexican and American authors who have used the concept of machismo as the central device to explain family roles in Mexican and chicano studies sums up his review of the literature with these statements:

---

[6] David Lopez-Lee et al., The Cal-State L. A. Chicano Student (Los Angeles: California State College, 1971).

> From the tremendous volume of literature that makes reference to the Mexican American family several generalizations emerge regarding their ideological, philosophical, and theoretical orientation. . . . First is the unquestioned acceptance of the "masculinity cult" to explain family roles. Unlike Mexican studies, however, machismo is not generally linked to what can be called a psychoanalytic orientation *per se,* but rather is arbitrarily interjected to explain family roles or concomitant problems *irrespective of the data available.* For instance, permeating the literature pertaining to the "problems of the Mexican American" is the idea that the nature of the family is best characterized by the cult of masculinity, which is said to be to blame for their problems. Secondly, this indiscriminate use of the concept of machismo coupled with what loose methodological approaches accounts for another characteristic of the literature -- low level theoretical sophistication. Finally, the strong evidence of speculation (plus the patronizing and condescending sentiments of the writings) further makes the findings and interpretations highly suspect.[7]

---

[7] Miguel Montiel, "The Social Myth of the Mexican-American Family," *Voices -- Recordings from El Grito (1967-71).* Emphasis in the original.

In spite of this questionable base of much of the literature dealing with machismo, at least one of the scholars interviewed felt that it was a quality which sould be examined, since it did relate to some of the problems faced by chicanos. His reply was that he feels that machismo is multidimensional, caused by sexual exhibition, stubbornness, individuality, or the attitude of "boss of the family." In the chicano community, any one of these may be the reason why these people do not agree on certain things. This behavior may be, to an extent, socioeconomically determined; but regardless of its origins, it is clearly present and must therefore be acknowledged and dealt with.

Probably the most significant implication of the findings of this report regarding machismo is that it is a factor which needs more thorough and responsible study than it has had until now. It seems that it can produce a stubbornness and an atmosphere of conflict that might require a training institution staff perceptiveness which would have to be somewhat complex. However, neither the specific nature of such awareness nor the means for developing it are now available, and the initial need for more thorough study of the concept again becomes central to any further study of machismo.

## Female Subservience

Another aspect of the extended family that may have relevance to the focus of this study is the role of the mother which is characterized, both by the literature and by the questionnaire respondents, as being the center of spiritual and effective cohesiveness of the family. This characteristic has been interpreted by many in a negative or pejorative way as female submission or subservience to the male -- wife to her husband, sisters to their brothers. This interpretation is particularly likely to arise when coupled with an analysis of machismo. Such an extreme pattern may exist in some particular places and situations, but there is no evidence that it exists as a general rule. It is clear, moreover, that the role of the female in the chicano family is undergoing rapid change. In an interview conducted for this study, Mario Garcia, Professor at San Diego State College, describes this change that is occurring as the result not of a reaction against the chicano family structure, but rather as a part of the general chicano reaction against oppression by the dominant culture:

> The family comes out of the class structure, therefore, it has a tie-in with the whole capitalist system. When you put the family structure in terms of chicano communities, . . . there are extended families, but they are extended families only because again it's a reaction to their oppression. Most people who have been migrant workers at one [time] or another have had to rely on large families in order to have more people -- the more people to work, the more money comes in. The same thing to some degree exists in urban areas. Again with . . . extended families, you find that in most the idea of chicano families popular concept you have the mother, the father, the kids, and all the other things. But you find that in many chicano communities in urban renewal that's not true. There is no father. The father has abandoned them -- and not because of the fact that he can't live with his family, but because of economic reasons he's forced to leave his family to find work. So to that extent the popular concept of the strong mother, father, children, really doesn't exist. Moreover, the chicano female -- the chicano within that family structure that does exist in the barrios and in other chicano communities -- is very oppressed. The chicano female represents the most oppressed of any member of the chicano community.

> She's oppressed as a woman, . . . as a worker, . . . oppressed as a member of a nationality, of a distinctive nationality group. She represents the most oppressed of any one within the chicano community. And for people who speak of and praise the chicano family and the role of the mother, it's just a lot of bull. She's extremely oppressed, and she is reacting against it.

With regard to its significance, then, both for performance by chicano trainees in programs and for their vocational outlook, the extended family, the motivational attitudes that arise from it, and the changing roles of family members that are interwoven in it should all be taken into consideration by program staff in making their planning and their day-to-day operating decisions. Perhaps a more primary concern is with the need for far more specific, focused, and responsible studies of all of these qualities of the chicano family.

In lieu of such studies, and perhaps of equal importance, is the need to encourage an attitude of openness toward trainee attitudes by staff. Since most of the characteristics discussed in this section vary radically in their nature and implications according to the specific circumstances of the trainee, even with the help of better studies, the staff member must still be aware of and sensitive to the very particular factors which color the general cultural characteristics of his trainees. This caution may seem overly obvious, but it is in response to the widely documented and widespread tendency on the part of those working with all nondominant population groups to generalize, to stereotype, and to be quite ignorant of the specific differences of their own trainees.

D. Although the degree to which it exists is not clear, some chicanos are deficient in English language skills, and for them this lack presents a serious barrier to successful training. Training staff ambiguity about possible solutions to this problem serve to aggravate the situation.

The evidence is strong that English is the native tongue of most chicanos in the United States. Nevertheless, the results of the questionnaire show that the staff respondents agree overwhelmingly in perceiving a lack of proficiency in English as an important roadblock to the vocational success of the chicano trainee. In fact, the answers to this section of the chicano questionnaire achieved the highest degree of consensus in the whole questionnaire. The panel discussion (see Appendix D) also pointed out that English deficiency is the initial stumbling block in education for many chicano children, and this primary negative experience is often a major factor in the poor preparation of trainees and other chicanos entering the labor market.

It is a fact that Spanish is still a very strong feature of many chicanos, but to what extent in specific numbers it persists as the only or one of the various functional languages of the chicano has not yet been determined in a national or even regional scope. And if little is known of the exact extent in numbers, much less is known about the nature and types of the monolingualism or bilingualism among chicanos. To this effect, Peñalosa, one of the chicano panelists, tries to make some inroads in this field that he considers completely unexplored.

> Such an axiom [that the chicano population is "bilingual"] should be scrutinized, for upon further examination, Chicano "bilingualism" turns out not to be so much an established fact as an extremely problematic field for research, virtually unexplored in any depth at all. True, there is

> bilingualism among Chicanos, but what is its extent? What is its nature? In what social contexts and for what purposes are the various linguistic codes used? What are the educational and other social consequences?[8]

Peñalosa also points out the practical significance of defining the range and dimensions of the linguistic phenomenon in the chicano population for the education of its students at all levels and types of instruction.

> . . . For example [in the case of a bilingual type of instruction or school], the question as to whether both languages shall be used in the same period to discuss the same subject, or whether only one language is to be used in a given time period should be settled, taking into consideration sociolinguistic as well as administrative factors.[9]

This concern with the need to deal directly with the problems of and perhaps the opportunities provided by, bilingualism in the classroom seems to be an obvious one. However, a curious ambiguity arises out of an analysis of the responses by training staff to questions concerning the use of a bilingual approach in training programs. It has already been noted that a large number of the respondents felt that a lack of proficiency in English has a strong detrimental effect on trainees' level of performance. In an attempt to find a solution to this problem, the questionnaire included questions asking how respondents thought the use of native language in training -- an essentially bilingual approach -- would effect various aspects of their training experience.

---

[8] Peñalosa, "Chicano Multilingualism and Multiplossia," *op. cit.*

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Of the interviewees, 74.7 percent feel that the use of the native language in occupational training would positively affect the trainees' willingness to enroll; 64 percent see the same influence in the trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in, 70.7 percent in the trainees' rate of progress within the program; 62.6 percent perceive the same beneficial influence in the trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program, and 68 percent in the trainees' self-image. With regard to the trainees' relationship with program personnel, the positive view is also high, notwithstanding the high absention percentage, which in this case sinply means that administrators, counselors, and instructors were answering only for their respective group or category. These results show that a great majority see the use of the native language as a helpful solution to the limitations and roadblocks suffered by a portion of the chicano trainees in the pursuit of successful training.

However, when that theoretical solution to chicano training problems is given a concrete, specific application in another question, the respondents rejected it as a solution. The question was phrased as follows: Do you think that your Mexican-American or chicano trainees should be taught occupational skills in his native language and taught English -- as a separate skill -- necessary to function in a job situation? The phrasing of the question reflects explicitly the awareness on the part of the questionnaire of the essential need for the mastering of English. It is not, then, an either/or type of situation, but rather a "this plus the other" type of solution, recognizing that both English and Spanish should be used, although each one for different reasons and purposes. Nonetheless, in spite of their earlier acceptance of the idea of using the native language in training, the respondents rather solidly rejected the specific application of the principle offered in this question. Only 32 percent of them thought that chicanos should be taught skills in their native language, and a solid 58.7 percent felt that this was not a good idea.

Thus we have the paradoxical and contradictory conclusion to an initially promising argument in favor of the use of Spanish as a teaching tool for those chicano trainees lacking proficiency in English. It might be pertinent to probe a little on the "why" of this break of logic between the premises and the conclusion. One possibility is that the response manifests the sort of mental blocks that arise when dealing with the use of a foreign language in an educational system pledged to uniformity. Another conscious or unconscious reason might be rooted on personal or vested interests of the interviewees, be they chicanos or whites, who not being bilingual could feel threatened in their positions once Spanish would be declared a legitimate and useful tool of instruction. A general support of this interpretation comes from one of the white instructors in a Skills Center who declared that, even though she as a teacher with a job felt very threatened by some of the questions (the one under discussion among them), she had to agree that there was a very good point to them.

Another reason might be the economic side of the matter. As another very dedicated white instructor said, "I have spent more than a year gathering and preparing all these training materials [audio-visual aids, etc.], and it has taken a lot of money and time. Now imagine how much it would take to duplicate all of it in Spanish." This instructor as an individual has a point, but the system as a system does not because if time and money can be spent to prepare materials in English, why not provide funds and time to do the same in Spanish, when those could be so beneficial to a large amount of chicano trainee population in the Southwest? And it must be pointed out here that if the chicano population, which is the target of the vocational centers, would be told that they can receive skills training in Spanish, the number of persons willing to enroll would increase considerably.

Another possible interpretation might be found in the following statement by a chicano instructor in a Skills Center:

> In order to train the Mexican-American, he must first be taught English. This is the language he must use every day to accomplish and transact business, to communicate with clerks, telephone operators, employers, etc. It is no service to the Mexican to teach him a skill in a language that he will not use. The chicano talks in "pachismos" -- a dialect far removed from upper-class Spanish -- and the bookish Castillian means nothing to him. In fact, being taught a skill in Spanish would be worse, because he would have to start by learning the language properly.

This objection, though, might be answered by teaching, not in Castillian, but in "pachismos," if this is an efficient way of communication for the trainee.

The whole question of bilingual training as a solution to the language problems of the chicano trainee, then, is by no means answered. As with so many other variables, it is still primarily in the realm of opinion, and since that opinion is so divided, once again the need is for a more systematic exploration of the many implications of bilingualism in learning. This is the emphasis that Peñalosa placed on the problem earlier, and it is an emphasis that is heightened by the apparent ambiguity among instructors and other staff toward the problem.

Another impetus that ultimately urges the use of Spanish in training is a consideration by some scholars of language as an essential ingredient in the survival of a culture. Language and culture are so mutually interdependent that the maintenance or disappearance of one of them determines the maintenance or disappearance of the other. Hernández writes:

> The survival of a human group depends upon the operation of its mechanisms or devices for overcoming threatening situations and for adaptation to diverse environments. If a more powerful group seeks to destroy a weaker group, through assimilation or other means, it begins by destroying the survival mechanisms of the weaker group. One of the major survival mechanisms of the Chicano or Mexican-American ethnic group is the Spanish language. A Chicano who cannot speak Spanish is culturally deprived, whatever the reasons. . . . The schools in the U. S. have been and are still primarily dedicated to one-language instruction: English. . . . If contemplated from the viewpoint of a stronger group's attempt to eradicate, through assimilation, oppression, suppression, or other means, a weaker group, then it does make sense to suppress the Spanish language. The Spanish language is a major survival mechanism.[10]

This monolingual bias may well be responsible for the rejection of a bilingual approach to training by questionnaire respondents. They may have had the one-language approach so ingrained in them by the educational system that they were unable to grasp the possibility of an alternative being any better.

---

[10] Hernández, "La Raza Satellite System" op. cit.

Another aspect of this same problem of the relationship of language to culture and the relationship of both of them to learning springs from the fact that those who face an unresolved conflict of cultural allegiances are held back in their progress in both languages. Expanding on the same idea, Peñalosa notes:

> Attitudes towards one's own ethnic group or a different one are believed to be strong predictors in success or failure in learning the language of each group. Thus the success of bilingual education for the Chicano, at least as far as the mastery of Spanish and English is concerned, is likely to be heavily dependent on the students' attitudes towards the majority culture and their own.[11]

It is obvious, then, that linguistic variables play a very important role in the outlook, success, or failure of chicanos in any kind or level of formal instruction. The responsibilities for dealing successfully with language lies with the two sides involved in the same endeavor, but each one in a different way: educational planners, administrators, and teachers on one side; and students or trainees on the other. Peñalosa spells out the specific tasks for each group:

> Further clarification of Chicano multilingualism and multiplossia is indeed urgent if educators are realistically to plan with the Chicano community for the education of the Chicano student. These phenomena must be made clear to the teacher himself, and he must make them clear to his students, so

---

[11] Peñalosa, "Chicano Multilingualism and Multiplossia," op. cit., p. 7.

> there will be mutual respect for the different varieties of speech and their speakers. At the same time students should be learning or improving those varieties of speech (codes) which will be needed or useful in the different life situations in which they will be finding themselves and for which their education is supposedly preparing them.[12]

Besides those tasks pointed out by Peñalosa as a responsibility of the first group, there is another which should be considered as a premise for any steps taken with regard to bilingualism: to accept it not as an "abnormal" or "temporary" type of phenomenon, but as a very "normal" and probably a rather long-lasting one in this country. He notes:

> Gumperz has pointed out the fact that total bi- or multilingualism is the rule rather than the exception in a wide variety of societies. . . . Chicano society (or culture, or subculture) is certainly then in this respect neither abnormal nor unusual. And inasmuch as the situation has persisted for more than a century and is still in full vigor, it is certainly not a mere temporary phenomenon which will be disappearing in the near future.[13]

It is this acceptance of bilingualism, as a viable, and perhaps even desirable means of operation, that is the crucial first step to dealing with the language situation of the chicano. If educational planners and instructors can accept this premise, then the whole question of the effect of the language characteristics of chicano trainees on their performance in training becomes one that can be approached, understood, and perhaps in the end resolved.

---

[12] Ibid., p. 10

[13] Ibid.

E. Several characteristics of the chicano that are commonly described as culture based are, in fact, when they exist at all, much more likely to be socioeconomically based.

1. The allegedly negative influence that barrio life has on training success is in fact due to the qualities that barrio life shares with all economically deprived ghettos.

In the section of the questionnaire dealing with the influence of barrio life on various aspects of training, that influence was seen to be universally negative with the exception of its effect on the trainee's relationship to fellow trainees. This stands in sharp contrast to the respondents' assessment of the influence of the extended family on training, which they saw as quite positive. Why this contrast? One possible explanation (conjecture yet nonetheless interesting) is that most people, including anthropologists and sociologists, look at any social structure beyond the limits of the family not so much as a cultural characteristic as a socioeconomic phenomenon. Insofar as this assumption is correct, it would also be sound to conclude that when the interviewees perceive the barrio as a negative influence, they are not blaming it as a cultural factor but as a socioeconomic one. And since there is little question that the socioeconomic predicament of the chicano has a negative effect on his performance in training, then as a manifestation of that predicament, the barrio is seen as a part of that negative effect.

In discussing the problems of developing business in the ghetto, the panelists in the discussion sponsored by the study provide an illustration of this acultural quality of the ghetto. In pointing out that business development in the barrio would incur higher costs than anywhere else in the city because of higher insurance costs, higher absenteeism, and higher turnover, they were careful to note that these last two problems -- absenteeism and turnover -- were not functions of the chicano culture but rather functions of the deprivation of the ghetto that cuts across all cultural lines. In pointing out the source of the problem, one panelist noted succinctly that, "You don't even have to introduce the word 'Chicano.' So long as you introduce 'lower levels of income' and 'lower levels of education,' then that is sufficient."

2. The alleged preference of chicano workers for manual labor is in fact not a preference at all but a choice forced on them by the labor market and other socioeconomic forces that deny them any upward mobility.

It is a popular idea to consider chicanos as especially inclined or equipped to perform manual skills. This stereotype has been an expedient, employed by high school counselors when advising chicano students in their career orientation. They often conclude that a manual trade or skill is the best prospect for a chicano student. The educational structure, as a very efficient servant of the dominant society, has in fact been assigning to specific population groups specific careers and slots in the socioeconomic world for a long time, and the way it justifies that approach has been to create a cultural ability or inability for certain types of work.

Thus even if we had found that chicanos themselves thought their brothers to prefer manual skills to any other type of work, the plausible explanations for it are either that (1) they have been brainwashed by the same dominant ideology, or (2) they are just being realistic, and so they have decided to "prefer" what sometimes is at their reach. Why bother aspiring for what is unattainable? One of the comments made to a question about chicano preference for manual training would summarize the point: "No more than any other ethnic group, but there again, our society treats them as outcasts, so what's available to them?"

A lengthy economic analysis by one panel member of the causes of this strict limiting of what job opportunities are available to the chicano bears repeating here, because it points out one of the key structures that discriminates against the Chicano, and that may well be the primary source of many stereotypes about him, especially the one that asserts that he prefers manual skill occupations. This analysis also indicates a possible source of many of the problems that chicanos encounter in training, and in any learning situation. We present his discourse in full in the following paragraphs.

> Economists in the past few years have been very interested in the concept of investment in human beings. That is the investment in the individual to a large extent determines the total earnings an individual will make in his lifetime. The average citizen in the U.S. -- by the age of 22 -- has invested a very large amount in himself. He has done this in two ways: One, the formal education provided by the community from public funds. The second one has been the salary he has given up while he is going to school. He has foregone considerable amounts of income during the four-year stay in college, plus he was also giving up some income while in high school. In addition, there are other investments made in the individual. When a person obtains employment, whether it is with a firm or the government, there is additional training provided for

the employee. The firm invests in the individual through executive training, managerial programs, or even training in special skills. Relating this to the chicano, we find that a very large number of chicanos have very low levels of investment as individuals. They lack in most instances professional or advanced training. Let me advance some reasons why I think that partially as a result of the culture of the chicano and to a large extent the impact of discrimination that this is the case.

The first and most critical reason is that the initial stages of learning for a chicano tend to be more expensive than that of the Anglo to achieve the same educational result. Chicanos at an early age, as a result of their bilingualism, in order to acheive the same level of education -- let us say the same reading proficiency -- need a higher level of expenditure per pupil than the Anglo. Chicanos need bilingual training, special books, and special programs -- all these are expensive, more expensive than a comparable Anglo program. The unfortunate reality is that as a result of their bilingualism or their bilingual culture, Chicanos need a higher expenditure per pupil during the primary years, but they in fact, due to discrimination, get less than the Anglo in terms of expenditure per student. Chicanos because of their lack of political power do not obtain the same expenditure per student. So the initial investment made for chicano students is much lower than that made for Anglo students. There is also a result of types of discrimination. The type of discrimination with which we are familiar is overt discrimination in terms of the individual's civil rights. But there is another kind of discrimination which I consider to be more expensive in the long run. It is that discirmination which is made in the allocation of public monies. Public expenditures which are made, not by the individual, but by governmental bodies, essentially discriminate against the chicano because of the housing pattern of chicanos: they live in a barrio or in a well-defined geographical area. If you examine the pattern of public spending, you will find that public schools in chicano areas are neglected. They have a lower expenditure per pupil than the Anglo areas. The discriminatory pattern of public spending is more pervasive than this because recreational opportunities, medical facilities, and the general welfare of the chicano is to a large extent determined by the pattern of public spending.

The second point is that chicanos, due to the lower level of income, are less able to give up wages that could be earned while they are obtaining additional education. Remember that foregone wages constitute a real cost to the chicano. When he goes to high school, or when he is in college, he not only has to pay the additional expense of tuition, books, etc., he also has to face the expense of not being able to earn during this period. So the special training, professional training, or even college training cannot easily be afforded by a low-income chicano. This result is due to the low levels of income of the chicano families, and more specifically in terms of the chicano culture, to families having a larger number of children. That means that the expenditure per child in a chicano family, given the same family income, compared to the Anglo family, is much lower. So the probability of that chicano family being able to afford to send a child to college is much lower than that of the Anglo family. . . . Fewer children essentially means a higher expenditure or the ability to make higher expenditure per child. So we have two things: one, chicano family income is lower than the Anglo; two, the expenditure per child in a chicano family is lower yet because of the higher number of children.

The third point is that the lack of general education on the part of a chicano also works against him. I am defining general education as a liberal arts degree or high school education. This lack of general education makes the employer very reluctant to invest in a chicano for a managerial or white-collar position. A prospective employer who is searching for a managerial trainee will be faced with some training costs per managerial trainee. If he hires a chicano, as compared to an Anglo, he will pay higher costs of training if he has to hire a chicano vis-à-vis an Anglo because the Anglo has had the benefit of higher investment prior to his being hired. He has had on the average a higher level of education. So a chicano presents to the prospective employer a higher expenditure in terms of the training than for his Anglo counterpart.

Let me now summarize: Occupational opportunities of chicanos will continue to be highly limited so long as the above pattern continues. We need to recognize several critical points. Chicano training calls for more money than Anglo training, and this is critical at the early stages. We also need to recognize that chicanos are less able to afford to give up wages during a training period. And third, firms hiring chicanos pay higher costs than if

> they hire Anglos for the same training program. As a result of a pattern of discriminatory public expenditures, chicanos have obtained much lower levels of investment from educational institutions financed from public funds. Chicanos need more funds than Anglos to achieve the same educational results, but they have received less. Finally, chicanos have larger families and have lower family incomes, a combination that results in a very low expenditure in the education of the children by the family.

In the face of such strong social and economic factors, it makes little sense to speak of a preference for low-skill jobs. The implication of these findings seems to be that rather than rationalize the status quo by calling it a cultural preference, effort should be focused on expanding the occupational choice of chicanos as widely as possible.

3. The alleged inability of the chicano to be motivated by anything other than immediate gratification is in fact -- where it exists at all -- a reflection of the poverty-based experience that chicanos share with other nondominant population groups that makes any long-range planning a luxury.

Some evidence rejects this stereotype outright. A study by Charles Weaver, cited in the panel discussion, inspects workers in a wide variety of occupations in San Antonio, Texas. His well-documented conclusion is simply that in every aspect of the occupations he studied, chicanos proved to be as dependable and efficient as white workers. There were no significant differences whatsoever between the whites and the chicanos studied.

Those spokesmen who do not reject this stereotype completely point out that simple economics prevent the chicano from planning ahead. Whether he is following various harvests as a migrant or waiting out his poverty in a barrio, he is always in the kind of economic crisis that forces him to focus all his energy on where his next meal is coming from or on how his next bill will be paid. There is no energy left to plan on levels other than that of immediate survival.

F. The stereotype of the chicano as unable to make a serious committment to a time-structured situation -- the "mañana syndrome" -- is not apparent among chicano trainees.

The strongest evidence in support of this hypothesis is that respondents to the questionnaire rejected it by a 2:1 ratio. Further solid evidence in support of this hypothesis is the conclusion of the study by Charles Weaver described in the previous section. Both instructors of chicano trainees and employers of chicano workers fail -- at least in these surveys -- to perceive their students or employees to be undependable in time-structured situations. This stereotype may arise from such characteristics as that of a cooperative rather than a competitive orientation which was described earlier in the chapter. Without a strong individual competitive urge, a chicano may appear to be unconcerned in a timed competitive situation. Wherever the stereotype arose from the results of the questionnaire and of Weaver's study, it was indicated that this hypothesis most probably does not hold true and should simply be abandoned.

## CONCLUSION

The findings of this study indicate that it is unwise to accept any generalizations that purport to cover the whole of the chicano culture. Nonetheless, there is a concern among chicano scholars and spokesmen that the culture be strengthened and preserved. This can best be accomplished, they say, by accepting the strengths in chicano culture and building programs based on those strengths, rather than trying to eliminate the culture by assimilating chicanos into the mainstream culture. The extended family and bilingualism are two such potentially culture-strengthening characteristics, and as such should be encouraged and developed. It is through such ethnic strengths, the spokesmen say, that chicanos will be better able to cope with the problems facing a minority culture in the United States. However, the findings of the study also emphasize strongly that much of what is attributed to the chicano pejoratively as coming from his culture is either predominantly economic and social in origin -- and therefore, not within the scope of cultural and language concerns -- or it simply does not exist whatsoever.

## 6

# NATIVE AMERICAN CONCERNS

The average yearly income of the native American is $1,500; unemployment among them ranges as high as 60 percent; and the average educational level achieved by them under federal supervision is five years of school. Statistics such as these outline the harsh results of more than a century of oppression, discrimination, and deprivation of the native American as whites pushed westward and vigorously implanted their European culture as the dominant one in the United States.

In recent years, attention has been focused -- both by those working with native Americans and by these people themselves -- on education as a key to improving the conditions that were the result of this oppression. Reflective of this concern, native enrollment at all levels of education had increased in recent decades. Unfortunately, this increase has not been matched by a proportionate rise in the percentage of native Americans successfully completing educational programs. A 1969 Senate report on the conditions of native American education points out that (1) more than one of every five men have less than five years of schooling, (2) dropout rates for native Americans are twice the national average, (3) only 13 percent of the students in federal "Indian schools" go on to college (the national average is 50 percent), and (4) only 3 percent of those who enroll in college graduate (the national average is 32 percent).

Clearly, then, there are serious problems either within the native American educational experience, or affecting it from outside, which are preventing it from being a successful means for escaping from the oppressive conditions that currently surround these people. It is with one aspect of this educational experience that this study concerns itself: manpower training programs. The question that frames the study concerns itself with one aspect of manpower training programs: What effect, if any, do native American cultural and language characteristics have on the level of performance and vocational outlook of native trainees?

The hypotheses that resulted from a consideration of this question are the result of the literature survey, the questionnaire, and the various interviews and conversations with native spokesmen and others concerned with him that are described in the section on methodology.

A. It is difficult to generalize about native American culture and language. The languages of different tribes are often completely distinct from one another, and there are few traits that are widely shared by tribes.

This is the most common hypothesis in this study, one that is shared equally by all the groups studied. It is of considerable importance because there is a natural and widespread urge to generalize about culture, and such stereotyping can easily result in the use of content or technique in a training program that, while it is quite appropriate for one group of native Americans, might be utterly inappropriate for another group in the same training situation.

Many studies have nevertheless attempted to identify those attributes shared by the native American community at large. In his survey on native education, for example, Berry[1] cites research identifying the following to be the most widely shared psychological characteristics among native Americans: reserve, generosity, individual autonomy, bravery and courage, fear of the world as dangerous, a "practical joker" strain, and dependence on supernatural power. Another source of this type of generalizing tendency is the non-native respondents to the questionnaire administered for this chapter of the study. From a list of sixteen potential cultural and language characteristics, this group of respondents identified thirteen as characteristic of their native American trainees.

However, the findings of this study argue much more strongly for an awareness of the differences between native Americans than for acceptance of any sweeping generalizations about them. Berry makes this point when he cautions against the very type of generalizing that he has just engaged in:

> At the time America was discovered, the differences in language and customs from tribe to tribe were as great . . . as those between the English and the Chinese. It is no less true today. Some groups, such as the Zuni and the Hopi, have retained a great deal of their culture, while others (Narrangansetts, Nanticokes, Chickahominy, Lumbees, etc.) have preserved very little, except their conviction that they are Indians. It is even hazardous to generalize about a particular community, since there are

---

[1] Brewton Berry, The Education of American Indians: A Survey of the Literature, Final Report (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968).

> cleavages and differences between the old and the young, and between the every-present conservatives and progressives.[2]

The research done by this study supports this assertion of strong differences among native Americans, and it indicates that some of those differences have implications for training programs.

In the area of sex role definition, a common stereotype is that of a domineering, warriorlike male and a subservient female. An illustration of this image is the observation of a respondent employed at one of the California Indian training centers:

> Husbands at times resent their wives' success or are not willing to allow their wives to complete their courses, should they be lagging behind the husbands. Indian wives tend to accept physical violence inflicted upon them by their husbands as an expected way of life. Husbands tend to consider some family considerations as beneath their dignity, such as caring for their children.

In opposition to that stereotype, however, are the perceptions of many other respondents. For example, a member of the White River Apache tribe maintains that contrary to initial impressions in some Navajo and Apache families, it is not unusual for the man to serve merely as a figurehead ruler. Behind the scenes the wife quite often holds the reins of power and makes the important decisions. This perception is in part supported by the results of the questionnaire in which native American respondents rejected male dominance and female subservience as being characteristic of the culture of their trainees.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 71.

Another example of this kind of diversity in native culture lies in the fact that while in some tribes women are usually excluded from certain religious ceremonies, in other communities, particularly on the east coast, women are not only included in important religious ceremonies but have in the past enjoyed a shaman-like status within the tribe.

A further diversity that Berry makes is that there exists differing attitudes between the old and the young. This difference manifests itself in the responses of some of the staff at centers in Arizona and New Mexico. They found that some of the older Indian trainees were reluctant to enroll in courses where women dominated. In the case of a cartography program where both men and women were enrolled, the older men preferred not to be situated in a work area adjoining that of a woman. On the other hand, the younger male trainees, ranging in age from late teens to mid-thirties, showed no outward concern over the presence of women in their classes.

One respondent, who taught at several different Bureau of Indian Affairs schools before his involvement in vocational education, provided a further example of the kind of diversity encountered just within the narrow confines of attitudes toward sex roles. Navajos, he said, had well-defined strictures regarding socializing between male and female members of the same clan. To avoid making any faux pas, the respondent seated the girls and the boys in his classes on separate sides of the classroom. When he was placed in an Apache school, he asked his students if the same strictures were maintained. While his students were fascinated by his description of Navajo social strictures, they gave no indication that any similar strictures existed within their own tribe.

There are other aspects of this diversity among the native Americans which are not directly related to training situations, but which are strongly enough present in trainees' lives to have a possibly significant indirect influence on training. One area of diversity is the varying perceptions that exist regarding the characteristic of extended family. Comments from respondents at one Navajo community college have suggested that Navajo culture is generally characterized by many extended families -- aunts, uncles, mother, or father living with the married couple. Elaborating on this same point they asserted that home, family, and land are all highly valued within the Navajo community.

On the other hand, one of the professors at the University of New Mexico points out that one can also find numerous nuclear families in the Navajo community. Some Navajos have found that numerous relatives who are unwilling to make a contribution to the general family upkeep are a heavy economic burden. Thus in some cases, to avoid their own failure as a result of such burdens, they have broken ties and moved away from the immediate vicinity of their families.

An additional indication that the generalization of extended family should be treated with caution lies in the ambiguous findings of the questionnaire about it. The native respondents did not perceive the extended family to be part of the culture of their trainees while the non-native respondents did. Beyond that, there was no agreement, even within each group of respondents, about the effect that the extended family had on the training experiences of native Americans.

Another area of diferentiation that is not directly related to the training experience, but which nonetheless could reveal a great deal about trainees' approach to problems, is the nature and degree of economic involvement that manifest themselves among different tribes. At present, for example, many of the Navajos on the reservation are involved in some form of subsistence agriculture. If the Four Corners[3] Regional Commission succeeds in putting its plans for economic development into operation, the Navajo Reservation will house an extensive irrigation and agriculture project. It is hoped that when the project is completed, it will be administered and operated by the Navajo tribe. As evidence of their involvement in the project, the tribal council has funded certain manpower training programs such as "Navajo Farm Enterprises." These projects are to train and qualify tribal members in such vocational areas as operation and maintenance of farm equipment.

Attempts have also been made to build up agricultural enterprises in the Apache community. In one such project, the results were less positive than in the Navajo project. So long as Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel were permitted to assist in planting, caring for crops, and overseeing the harvest efforts were relatively productive. However, when Apaches were directed to assume complete responsibility for the enterprise, it gradually failed. Whether through a lack of interest or a lack of sufficient supervisory assistance, the project was unproductive.

In another instance, a Bureau respondent asserted that the Apache in a cattle-raising project showed little interest and eventually non-native ranch hands had to be hired to care for the cattle. It is quite possible that there are many factors operating in these situations which are more important than tribal attitudes. However such divergence in the results of economic enterprises bears further investigation so that whatever the reason the Navajo are experiencing more success in this type of project, projects can be more specifically designated to meet the particular needs of the Apache, which do not seem to be the same as those of the Navajo. One possible explanation, one that is supported by the ways that members of the two tribes operate in economic enterprises, might be that Navajos are more inclined toward group organization and endeavor, while Apaches are more inclined toward individual activities. Such a distinction has some clear implications for training.

---

[3] "Four Corners" is the geographical point where four states -- Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico -- meet.

B. Language problems are a barrier for some native Americans to successful training and employment.

There is a variety of statistics which indicate the extent of spoken language problems among the native Americans. More than half of the children in federal schools, for example, do not use English as a first language. More than 15 percent of all native schoolchildren come from homes in which no English is spoken. A report by the Arizona Employment Security Commission concerning the Navajo Reservation unemployed labor force -- which was 62 percent of the total Navajo labor force -- found that 42 percent of the unemployed could not speak English.

Literacy is also a problem. Of that same unemployed labor force 50 percent could not read or write. The 1969 Senate report on native American education indicates the breadth of this literacy problem. Using as a definition of literacy, five years or more of schooling, the report note that in 1969 there were 57, 448 native Americans between the ages of fourteen and sixty-five with less than five years of school completion. There is also no guarantee that every Navajo who reached that level in school was actually able to perform at that level.

Social attitudes which surround the entire question of language ability and learning can make the problem even more severe. Many native adults, for example, did not begin to learn English until they were in their teens. Because they did not begin learning English at a preschool or primary level, the experience has often been a slow and tedious one for them, and has sometimes left them with only minimal language skills and a marked accent in speaking. Furthermore policies that were sometimes operative when they were learning the language have left deep scars on some language learners. For those now between the ages of thirty and fifty, instances of being publicly degraded for speaking their native tongue or for manifesting some cultural trait were fairly common.

This kind of treatment often produced a solid antipathy toward the learning of English, and in fact was likely to have a negative effect on any learning environment in which native Americans encounter non-native instructors. One respondent noted that these people often learned their English from merchants, shop owners, etc., who were not particularly well developed in their own mastery of English and who knew nothing of the methods of teaching a language. This particular group of "instructors," asserts the same respondent, also tended to blame the native for the poor quality of their language learning, thus exacerbating an already bad situation.

With regard to the nature of the language problems that some native Americans face, it has already been noted that a significant number of them come from homes where only a tribal language has been spoken. Their first contact with English may be when they first go to school. Others are definitely bilingual. They have been dealing with two languages perhaps since birth. Still others, such as many of the Cherokee in Oklahoma and other upper Midwestern tribes, speak only English. With these last, language problems are not culture bound, but rather are the problems shared by any rural group when faced with the need to shift from their regional speech to the standard English which characterizes textbooks and instructional aids.

There is a variety of specific language problems identified by the respondents to the questionnaire. One asserted that many tribal tongues do not use the same sounds as in English, and consequently, native Americans may have articulation problems that might cause them to be misunderstood. At one Skills Center the director noted that the program had not been successful in teaching its students to use the dictaphone because the native clerical students consistently omitted the correct verb tenses in using the machine. This is a rather direct way in which the particular problems that natives have with language can interfere with the level of trainee performance and vocational outlook.

There was also an emphasis among questionnaire respondents on the need for English language training as an occupational skill. Although some skills can be learned without English mastery, they say, English is needed in order to read trade manuals, instructions, and in order to function with even minimum facility on the job market.

The questionnaire respondents tended to reject traditional language learning methods, such as translation. They also criticized the fact that new English as a second language materials were developed only with European or Eastern orientation, never with an orientation to the specific needs of the native Americans.

C. There are no cultural attributes which by themselves interfere with the native American's ability to learn in training programs. However, many instructors fail to understand, or even to perceive cultural attributes which are relevant to the learning situation. It is this lack of awareness that often results in teaching that is so ineffective that it jeopardizes the success of the students subjected to it.

Perhaps the strongest support for this hypothesis comes from the fact that of the sixteen supposedly cultural characteristics that non-native and native staff were asked to assess on the questionnaire, there were only five on which both groups agreed. Moreover, in the evaluation of the effect that these various characteristics had on training performance, there was only a single item on which the two groups agreed. This divergence points to a serious gap between the perceptions of native characteristics by non-natives and by the native Americans themselves. Many respondents expressed a concern for a lack of effective communication between them and trainees, which prevents them from meeting trainee needs. They noted a tendency by trainees to avoid verbal responses, and felt that a primary effort that they often had to make with new students involved just getting them to speak at all. This nonverbal characteristic was perceived to be especially evident in conflict or other problem situations. Thus the instructors themselves see the educational situation of the native American trainee as ripe for misunderstandings, if for no other reason than because of a poor interpersonal communications system between students and instructors.

Although this gap may be in part due to language difficulties of trainees, another factor in its existence is the difference between the values and perceptions of natives and those of non-natives. An example of this difference that is particularly relevant to training is the native American attitude toward competition. While competition is central to the functioning of the mainstream culture, it is not a normal quality of tribal life, perhaps because it contradicts certain values that the native holds strongly. In order to compete, one must set himself apart from others.

Within the native communities that have a high degree of cultural solidarity, there is a strong feeling of tribal identity. Often it is the chief or other tribal leaders that speak for the people of the tribe. It is not normal for individuals to offer differing opinions on tribal matters. They seem to some observers to have less a need to express themselves in the individual ways that are so common in the dominant culture.

Perhaps this lack of focus on individuality is in part the result of a treatment of children by parents and other tribal members as individual and responsible at an early age. Children are both respected and provided with prescribed routes by which they move toward adult responsibility and privilege. Because in this process, the child is clearly and concretely acknowledged as an individual with a role to play in the tribe, he may well feel less a need to establish his own independence through competition.

This bias against competition is socially reinforced, particularly in situations where a native American has been away from the influence of the tribe. One of the instructors in language arts at the Institute of American Indian Arts noted that when students first entered the Institute from the public schools, they were both competitive and verbally responsive in class. However, after a few weeks they would be relatively unresponsive. He attributed this change in part to the pressure that others exert on new arrivals to abandon their "white" behavior patterns and act more "native American."

The relevance of this attitude toward competition to training situations becomes clear when the difference between the responses of the natives and non-natives to questions concerning competition are noted. Quite simply, the natives do not see competitiveness as a characteristic of their native trainees, while non-native respondents do see it as a characteristic of their native trainees. Whichever group is accurate in their observations, one of them clearly is misunderstanding their students and probably organizing their teaching methods, in part at least, around that misperception.

Way and Thomas in an article called "American Indians and White People" note one clear classroom implication of this lack of awareness of the native American's attitude toward competitiveness. A native child who receives a gold star on his class progress chart may respond to the recognition with embarassment. A native student praised before his classmates for his intelligent answer or outstanding work may decide to volunteer no more answers in the future. Part of the explanation for such behavior lies in the fact that a student singled out in such a manner may be more conscious of what he sees as an implicit criticism of his classmates who have been working just as hard. Way and Thomas suggest that

> . . . [T]hey [Indian parents] do not praise or reward their children for doing what is proper and right; they are expected to behave well, for this is "natural" or "normal." Thus a "good" Indian child reflects no special credit on himself

or on his parents. He is simply behaving as a child of his people should behave. On the other hand, the "bad" or ill-intentioned child is censured, and the child who makes mistakes is shamed, which, in an Indian community, is a grave punishment.

This extreme reaction to public verbal criticism is another characteristic with obvious implications for classroom situations. Apparently, the use of physical force is almost unheard of in normal families in native American communities. According to some researchers, such a high stigma is attached to public verbal denouncement that parents use it as an extreme form of punishment. The connotation that this attitude gives to verbal exchange in the classroom makes such exchanges a very sensitive area that must be approached by instructors with understanding -- an understanding that, from the results of the questionnaire, does not seem to exist in any great depth.

Another characteristic that may cause problems in training as a result of misunderstandings by instructors arises from the fact that native American children are accorded a degree of independence and responsibility comparable to that of adults. Often, for example, they take an active and major part in decisions which involve them, such as going away to boarding school. This atmosphere of independence is also present in some of the government day schools set up for these people. Children are permitted to wander around the classroom during lessons. Time allotments for homework are less strictly defined and less strictly adhered to than in public schools. In secondary school students may be permitted to leave during class if they decide they do not wish to attend that day. As a result they frequently tend to respond inappropriately when unexpectedly transferred to highly structured situations.

An example which vividly demonstrates this has been provided by a counselor who administered educational tests. Having distributed the testing materials and given the instructions, he took out a stopwatch to time the section the students were working on. When he told the students to begin, the non-natives began to work rapidly. The Navajo in the group got up, walked around the room, and asked the examiner for a closer look at the stopwatch since he had not seen one like it before. While this incident is an illustration, not a proof, it does describe a trend that many of the questionnaire respondents and other interviewees tend to confirm.

Each of the problems discussed so far can be seen as aspects of the native American's rejection of competition. And a further indication of that rejection is manifested in the native trainee's preferences in teaching and learning methods. These people tend to reject, according to staff surveyed, traditional class participation methods of instruction. They show a marked preference for individualized, programmed study, and in some cases, have responded positively to role playing. Both of these methods are probably popular because they avoid direct competition and provide the trainee with structured defenses against being singled out from his fellow trainees.

A further characteristic -- one not directly related to competition, but one that could create problems in training situations if it were misunderstood -- is the attitude of many native Americans toward illness. In the event that a native trainee from certain tribes is examined by the school physician and found to be well, and yet he still believes himself to be ill, he is likely to leave suddenly, return to the tribe, and consult the medicine man.

With all of the cultural characteristics cited above, the problem is not that there is an innate attitude that might interfere with the trainee's performance. Some of them could in fact function to improve that performance. However, with all of them, if they are misunderstood by instructors, and if those instructors structure their classes and their own actions in ignorance of the implications of such characteristics, at the least those classes will fail to elicit the best possible responses from trainees, and they may work very directly to ensure no positive responses from trainees.

D. Two factors that contribute greatly to separating many native Americans from the "mainstream" of American experience are the poverty and rural isolation that have consistently been the lot of so many of them. Although it is impossible to fully isolate the effect of poverty and isolation from the effect of culture, there is evidence to show that poverty and isolation are more likely to be the cause of some native American educational problems than are cultural variables.

The breadth of living experience of the native American appears to have a considerable impact on the level of his performance in educational programs. Gaps that may exist between a trainee's experience and the program's assumptions about that experience -- even in such mundane matters as knowing how to use the local bus system -- may seriously hinder the trainee's participation in a program.

Economically, most reservation areas are underdeveloped. In the case of the Navajo, business and commerce are generally concentrated along the interstate highways across the reservation. Thus opportunities for any prolonged contact with the non-native community are minimal. The native American, consequently, has rather limited insight into non-native behavior and social structures.

This lack may partially explain why government attempts to move these people from the reservations to urban areas have met with such little success, why from 70 to 85 percent of those relocated eventually return to the reservation. This tie to the reservation can have a somewhat direct effect on training program success. If the environment of the center is too foreign to the trainee, he may be strongly tempted to return to the less promising, but more familiar reservation. This inclination to return to the familiarity of the reservation is encouraged also by the strong family ties that both groups of respondents to the questionnaire agree was a cultural characteristic of their trainees. If the family tells the trainee that he is needed at home, he is very likely to go, even if there is no possible use there for the skills he is acquiring. Several of the Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel interviewed provided examples of this phenomenon. In this case, then, the cultural characteristic -- strong family ties -- reinforces one of the results of the socioeconomic factor of rural isolation to create a situation that has serious implications for the approach that training programs take to their trainees.

The poverty from which the native American often suffers has many implications for the level of his performance in training. The ghetto-quality basic education that he often receives as a child manifests itself in situations such as the one presented by a commercial art instructor in one training center: The instructor displayed some of the student's art work, explaining that his people's almost total lack of any contact with art in elementary and secondary school made it necessary for this boy to begin much more basically than would have been necessary for a group of non-poverty students.

Another example of the influence of poverty is the observation by an instructor in Oklahoma that his trainees who came from rural Mississippi, and who were considerably more deprived even than his poor Oklahoman trainees, had a significantly lower level of language skills than the Oklahomans.

Perhaps the most significant implication of poverty for the native American is that low income imposes a continual crisis orientation on many families. Making ends meet for that day or week takes precedence over any long-range planning. Parmee has pointed out in his study of the San Carlos Apache that

> Under such conditions of poverty and unemployment, home life and schooling are bound to suffer. As people live from day to day in "economic misery," the simple tasks of home life, such as getting the children off to school each day, become great hurdles, and any plans for the future become swallowed up by the overriding problems of today. In such circumstances parental size and complexity of the daily family trials.[4]

Thus what may appear to an outsider to be laziness and apathy are often the visible symptoms of a preoccupation with daily survival. The practicality of long-range planning is problematic for the native American under such circumstances. This difficulty of making any long-range plans is intensified by the harsh economic fact that the only jobs to which this population has immediate access tend to be seasonal employment or subsistence agriculture, both of which function to reinforce the cycle of poverty and crisis existence.

---

[4] Edward A. Parmee, Formal Education and Culture Change (Tucson; University of Arizona Press, 1968).

A further aggravation of this pattern arises from the nature of some training programs. Programs often fail to prepare trainees for such problems as complex job qualifying exams, union membership requirements, and other certification requirements. This is sometimes the result of poor planning, sometimes circumstances beyond the control of the program (such as discriminatory union practices), and sometimes the result of the too short training cycle built into training programs. There is just not enough time to provide a trainee with the skills that he needs, with the remedial work he may need before he can move through the program successfully, and with the special preparations he may need to meet additional requirements of the occupation and the labor market he is entering. In the face of these problems, many native Americans have come to look on training programs with their stipends as much the same as seasonal employment. They complete a training cycle, are rejected by the job market, and return later for training in another area. The major implication of this criticism is that as a result of his extreme poverty, his rural isolation, and his language problems, the native American trainee -- to the extent that he shares these characteristics -- cannot successfully move through the structure of most training programs as they now exist. The program must be able to adjust to his often substantial needs.

Thus the native American has some cultural characteristics that -- however much they must be modified by his particular circumstances -- should be better understood by the program personnel that he encounters in training. He also has a need for language programs that are focused on his particular needs, again with the caution that it is a mistake to apply the same language assumptions and materials to all natives. Finally, he is often severely deprived, not because of his culture, but rather because of the extreme poverty and rural isolation from which he often has suffered.

## 7

# APPALACHIAN WHITE CONCERNS

In the three groups studied thus far -- blacks, chicanos, and native Americans -- there seems to be general agreement that social and economic factors are much more likely to have a significant effect on the level of performance of group members in training programs and on their vocational outlook than are cultural and language factors. These findings concerning the Appalachian whites indicate that the same is true for them.

## A. Cultural and language variables do not significantly affect the training performance of Appalachian white trainees.

Perhaps the evidence that points most clearly to this hypothesis can be found in a summary of the responses of Skills Center staff members to questions about the cultural characteristics of their trainees. The respondents were asked whether they perceived any of the following characteristics to be cultural features of their Appalachian white trainees. The percentage of respondents who answered "yes" or "no" precedes each characteristic in the following tabulation:

Which of the following do you consider cultural features of your Appalachian trainees?

| Percentage Responding | | | Characteristic |
|---|---|---|---|
| No | Yes | | |
| 64.2% | 35.8% | 1. | Extended family (ties with members outside the parent-child family unit). |
| 43.3 | 56.7 | 2. | Close family ties and family interdependence. |
| 80.6 | 19.4 | 3. | Achievement for the family rather than individually oriented. |
| 58.2 | 41.8 | 4. | Father head of the family. |
| 68.7 | 31.3 | 5. | Male dominance (authoritarian figure). |
| 61.2 | 38.8 | 6. | Mother: Center of spiritual and effective cohesiveness of family. |
| 71.6 | 28.4 | 6.5. | Female subservience. |
| 28.4 | 71.6 | 7. | Rural style of residence and life. |
| 79.1 | 20.9 | 8. | Achievement oriented toward the community, the local group. |
| 62.7 | 37.3 | 9. | More cooperatively oriented than competitively oriented. |
| 46.3 | 53.7 | 10. | Speakers of an "Appalachian" dialect. |
| 97.0 | 3.0 | 11. | Bilingual. |
| 58.2 | 41.8 | 12. | Free of anxiety in their attitude toward time. |
| 67.2 | 32.8 | 13. | Undependable in time-structured situations. |
| 58.2 | 41.8 | 14. | Strong religious feelings and affiliations. |
| 73.1% | 26.9% | 15. | Superstitious in their beliefs. |

A slight majority of the respondents found "close family ties and family interdependence" and "speakers of an Appalachian dialect" to characterize their trainees, but the only characteristic to emerge from these statistics as conclusively descriptive of the trainees was not properly a cultural feature. "Rural style of residence and life" is not the result of culture, rather it is socioeconomic or even geographical facts of existence which may or may not influence trainees' behavior, but which are not properly within the scope of this study.

The substantial number of conjectures from literary sources alleging that the Appalachian white population embodies a variety of common characteristics, such as extended family, lack of time anxiety, strong religious feelings, Anglo-Saxon (early Elizabethan) speech patterns, etc., makes the generally negative responses of training center personnel toward these issues surprising. There could be three different reasons for these responses: (a) there are few significant differences, cultural or otherwise, between occupational trainees from Appalachia and any others; (b) There may be perceptible differences, but staff members remain oblivious to them because they themselves share the same characteristics; or (c) in the minds of training staff, whatever general characteristics exist that conceivably separate the training needs of Appalachian whites from any other population groups are not fundamentally "cultural" differences, but are due rather to other factors which may appear to be cultural.

The evidence strongly points to (c) as a most reasonable explanation of why the interviewees responded as they did. While respondents indicated on other parts of the questionnaire that family structure, "life-style," etc., had distinct effects on trainee outlook and performance, there was a general refusal to identify or "label" these characteristics as being "cultural." In many cases, those interviewed went beyond the questions asked to note that given such economic improvements as a large job market, a stimulated regional economy, etc., "any problems stemming from a family dialect, or any other so-called regional characteristics would quickly evaporate." In short, it was felt by most respondents that underlying causes for training-related problems had a great deal more to do with economic conditions of the area than with "cultural issues." The reasons for ostensibly different behavior patterns on the part of Appalachian trainees, then, probably have more to do with the "culture of poverty" than other cultural issues.

As an interesting sidelight, the interviews and conversations with training staff revealed a great sense of regional pride on the part of almost all interviewees. If any differences between "Appalachian types" and "others" were stressed, it was with an emphasis on the positive attributes of the local society (strong work ethic; contributions to music, literature, culture, etc.). Respondents were careful to point out that these attributes which they identified were positive ones. They also gave no indication that these attributes had anything to do with the problems faced by Appalachians in training programs.

B. The rural style of residence and life, close family ties, and the Appalachian dialect are identifiable characteristics in the lives of Appalachian white trainees. However, the first characteristic is a socioeconomically derived factor, and the study produced no clear relationship between the other two and the level of trainee performance.

A substantial number of respondents identified a rural style of residence and life as characteristic of Appalachian trainees, though that characteristic is socioeconomic and geographic. There were slight indications that the respondents perceived close family ties and an Appalachian dialect to be characteristic of their trainees. In general, however, none of these factors was perceived to have a particularly significant effect on a variety of aspects of trainee life.

The family structure was perceived to have a moderately positive effect on trainee willingness to enroll in programs, on trainee occupational preference, and on trainee orientation to continuous employment. While this is perhaps useful information, it does not seem to differ significantly from the kind of information gathered about any other group. It is by no means unique to Appalachian whites. There were no other particularly significant relationships uncovered by the qestionnaire between the characteristics listed earlier in this chapter and the life of the trainees. The Appalachian dialect that was seen by some respondents as a characteristic of their trainees was perceived to have only a minimal effect of training and would affect the trainee adversely only if he were seeking a professional-level job in a metropolitan area outside the Appalachian region.

### C. Training staff perceive a preference for training in manual skills among Appalachian trainees, but this seems more likely to be a response to economic and geographic realities than a cultural characteristic.

A large percentage (74.6) of the respondents felt that trainees show a great preference for training in manual skills. The reasons for this preference were not tested in the study, but speculation allows for such possibilities as: (a) availability of training in the area, based upon the job market (predominantly low skilled), (b) the influence of family and peers, and (c) the influence of general economic conditions in the area, etc. There was no clear-cut feeling that language or cultural factors in any way caused this preference.

D. Whatever differences exist (if any) between the performance of Appalachian white trainees and some supposed national norm are the result not of culture and language, but of economic environment.

This hypothesis is derived from the suggestions of many respondents that any search for factors that influence Appalachian whites in training should focus on economic factors rather than on cultural and language factors. It is also a deduction from the results of the questionnaire, which indicate that respondents see no cultural or language factors as having any more than the slightest influence on training.

This hypothesis suggests that those who conduct training programs would probably find it more fruitful to approach the problems of their trainees as part of an economic and social pattern that may also include cultural factors. To look for cultural variables to explain these problems is to turn away from the center of the problem and create a danger that these problems will never be completely understood.

In considering the effect of family structure, life-style, and socioeconomic characteristics on various aspects of trainee experience, we compared the answers of the total population of white respondents in all four samples with those of the white respondents in the Appalachian sample. This comparison was intended to determine whether there was a difference between the attitudes of the larger group of white staff toward their predominantly nonwhite trainees and the attitudes of the white Appalachian staff toward their predominantly white trainees.

The questionnaire results indicate that in several areas a slight difference in the responses of the two groups did exist. These differences can perhaps be interpreted to indicate a slightly more positive attitude by white staff toward white trainees than there is by white staff toward nonwhite trainees. However, these findings are statistically far from conclusive, and in order to determine whether such slender indications actually point to significant information, we would have to analyze those findings in conjunction with many of the other findings of the survey, such as those regarding misconceptions by staff of trainee characteristics. The data collected in this survey are not detailed enough to allow this kind of careful cross referencing that such an analysis would entail. It remains for a more limited and detailed study to explore this sensitive cross-cultural, or cross-racial area.

## 8

# GENERAL HYPOTHESES

The general hypotheses of this report are drawn from those hypotheses about the specific minority groups which seem to have significance not only for the specific group that they are describing but also for nondominant population groups in general. These include those hypotheses which are shared by more than one group, as well as specific observations which might provide insights into groups other than the one about which a given observation is made. It is important to keep in mind that these are hypotheses, not firm conclusions, and are generalizations of generalizations. They are supported by the data collected in this study, but are not conclusively "proved" by those data. Perhaps the best way to approach these hypotheses is -- as the term "hypothesis" suggests -- as a series of assertions supported by all of the available data and deserving of further exploration and testing to determine the full implications that each of them has for the training experiences of minority groups. When policy decisions are needed they must be made on the basis of what is known without waiting for all of the facts to be in. We have sufficient confidence in these hypotheses to base recommendations upon them. But we recommend further exploration for full assurance and firm policies.

A. The differences that exist within each of the minority population groups in this study are often so pronounced that they make generalizations about a given group too inaccurate to be a useful base for practical recommendations.

The approach that the chapter on chicanos takes to this hypothesis indicates the kind of thoroughness that must accompany any study which seeks to generalize about a population group. It was pointed out in that chapter that there were attitude differences, geographic differences, and differences in economic situations, all of which would have to be considered in detail as modifiers of any course of action determined by one of the culture-wide generalizations that follow.

This same caution surrounds the hypotheses formulated about the native Americans. In almost every cultural area with which the study concerned itself, a wide range of variation among the tribes was found. Thus it becomes necessary -- when considering the effect of such factors as family structure, attitude toward time-structured situations, and language on native American trainees -- to note very specifically what tribe or tribal subgroup is being analyzed. Without this specification such generalizations are counterproductive. Probably more than for any other group, however, the study did find culture-wide characteristics that hold for this ethnic group. However, these too should always be subject to modification by the specific situation of the trainees involved.

One characteristic that seems to be widely shared by native Americans is poverty and the physical, social, and developmental deprivation that accompany it. Perhaps the reason that the study rejects generalizations about culture and language so emphatically is that in all of the groups it was their socioeconomic plight that was seen as the most commonly shared characteristic, overshadowing cultural considerations. In fact, the perception of the study was that for blacks and Appalachian whites, no cultural characteristics existed which had any significant effect on training. Social and economic considerations were the only significant factors.

Difficult as generalizations are, however, there can be no analysis and policy prescriptions without them. Therefore, we proceed cautiously to generalizations, conclusions, and recommendations with due awareness of the tenuousness of doing so.

### B. Culture, viewed as a factor in the learning process of a trainee from any of the minority groups studied, does not generally interfere with those trainees' ability to learn.

Although some of the respondents to the questionnaire, instructors in manpower training programs, thought that there were characteristics of their trainees which interfered with their ability to succeed in training, and although a great deal of the literature surveyed assumed a variety of cultural variables operating in the learning process of minority trainees, there was no substantial evidence uncovered by this study that supported the existence of these variables. In fact, when the overall evidence regarding any one of the groups studied is gathered and reviewed, the implications tend to be relatively strong that the perceptions of some instructors and of the literature mentioned above are inaccurate.

The results of the Appalachian white questionnaire strongly refute the stereotypes that are casually attributed to that group in a wide range of literature. Both the literature surveyed and the respondents contacted in the black section of the study strongly rejected cultural factors as playing any significant role in the black training experience. The study found chicano and native American respondents more willing to identify actual cultural characteristics, but both groups argued strongly against the assertion that any of these characteristics, in themselves, interfered with the performance of members of those groups in training.

C. For blacks, Appalachian whites, most chicanos, and many native Americans, there are no linguistic variables that create serious obstacles to the learning process in training programs. In all of these groups English tends to be the dominant language. Some in these groups are inadequately skilled in English, and for them this deficiency is an obstacle. For chicanos and some native Americans, whose retention of their native language is generally more pronounced than in other groups, language tends to function as a more significant factor in training.

As do the first two hypotheses, this one cautions against casual assumptions with regard to culture-wide characteristics. In two groups -- blacks and Appalachian whites -- there are strong indications that culture-bound language problems simply do not exist. They may well share the same language problems that all economically deprived people face, but in that case attempts to deal with those language problems need not be delineated by the characteristics of the particular cultural group. In fact, failure to recognize that their problems are primarily the result of poor preparation and lack of wide experience, rather than the result of some inalterable cultural characteristics, could hinder efforts to correct the situation.

For bilingual chicanos and native Americans, and for members of those groups who are monolingual speakers of a language other than English, there are clearly problems that need to be faced. However, a major finding of the study is that these problems have not even been adequately defined, much less solved. There is a critical lack of thorough and specific analyses of the language problems faced in these groups and an often-expressed need for language learning materials that are developed for the specific needs of these groups. There has also been a failure to differentiate between language problems which interfere with the ability to communicate and learn and those which may bring a negative response from training staff and discrimination in hiring from employers.

Thus the concerns of this hypothesis are twofold: On the one hand, language problems that are not culture bound should be recognized and treated as such, and on the other hand, language problems that are culture bound need to be thoroughly analyzed and dealt with within a cultural framework. The study found that in many situations, neither of these goals had been achieved.

Further examination of the data gathered in this study produces three additional hypotheses for the study (discussed below in D, E and F).

D. Although it does not significantly interfere with a trainee's ability to learn, culture does function as a factor in various misunderstandings of minority trainees by instructors and other staff, misunderstandings that can cause the teacher, and the learning environment he creates, to be ineffective. In other words, staff attitudes toward, and perceptions of trainee characteristics are a more significant factor in the learning process than are any characteristics themselves.

The study indicates that this problem of misperception of trainee cultural characteristics exists in training programs of blacks, chicanos, and native Americans. In some cases the evidence is a pronounced difference between the dominant population group staff and the minority staff working with a given group. In other cases, such as with the rejection of competition as motivation by many native Americans, the characteristic will be identified, and then several instances of the ways that teaching can ignore this characteristic -- can work against it -- will be uncovered. Often staff will attribute to culture those behavioral characteristics that are in fact due to the crisis-bound, impoverished life that the trainee undergoes.

E. The economic deprivation, the limitations on experience and opportunity, and the poverty-dominated social atmosphere shared in different forms by many members of the minority groups encompassed by this study are much more likely to combine to create obstacles to successful training and to well-developed vocational aspirations than are specific cultural and language variables.

This hypothesis is more strongly asserted by questionnaire respondents and minority group spokesmen than any other in this study. With every group studied there was strong agreement that cultural and language problems faded into insignificance when compared to the critical and pervasive effects of socioeconomic factors. If these widely expressed concerns are to be heeded, then it clearly becomes necessary for any study of cultural and language problems to see itself as a secondary concern, one that may provide some mitigation of the problems of nondominant population groups, but one which is not addressed to the heart of the problems that these people face.

Many of the sources in the black and chicano sections of the study point out that the ghetto and the barrio are not culturally chosen, but rather economically determined existences in which no choice is allowed. The same distinction is made in answer to the argument that members of several groups prefer training in manual skills. Many study sources reply that it is pointless to speak of "preferences" when -- because of social and economic factors -- no real choices exist. The depressing effect that poverty has on education is outlined in several sections, with a particularly interesting description of chicanos as human resources who, because of their economic situation, have been underinvested in (educationally), and therefore are not as valuable to an employer as a dominant culture member who has been able to invest considerably more in his education and development.

F. There are preferences for life-styles and location which dissuade some minority group members, particularly those from rural backgrounds, from taking full advantage of the learning opportunities provided by improved employability. Such preferences are understandable and not to be criticized. However, there must be realistic alternatives and each individual should have and know he has freedom of geographical and occupational choice and access to the standard and acceptable life-style.

The implications of the last three hypotheses -- that it is not culture, but staff misunderstandings of culture, and even more important, that it is economic deprivation that is the overriding cause of educational problems -- give rise to the final hypothesis of the study as seen in G below.

G. Any effective assessment of the educational problems of minority group members in training programs is not complete unless it includes the social, economic, and political realities, as well as the cultural and linguistic characteristics, of the trainee's environment.

This is the logical conclusion of all the hypotheses presented above. Essentially it is a common-sense caution that there is no single solution to this intricate complex of problems. In fact, any exclusive focus on just one of these areas of concern could never solve the problems faced by minority trainees. The problems clearly rise as a result of all of these various influences, and it is a logical necessity that any attempt to solve these problems must consider all factors that produced them.

This hypothesis actually extends beyond the scope of the study, and as such, cannot be developed in great detail here; but it is a direction to which the study clearly points, and any further attempts to assess and alleviate the problems of minority group members in manpower training programs should clearly begin with this hypothesis as the basis of such a study.

# 9

# RECOMMENDATIONS

Even though the findings of the study are stated tentatively, policy must be based upon whatever enlightenment is available. While a first recommendation would have to be further research to more definitively probe differences in response by age, sex, ethnic origin, and education, and to develop programs and procedures to compensate for various differential factors, the data and analysis from the study clearly support five general recommendations and four subsidiary ones:

1. The basic finding of this study should be widely disseminated and emphasized among administrators and staff of manpower training programs.

That is, though cultural differences exist and may affect the readiness to learn and the cognitive learning style of trainees, they do not interfere with their basic ability to learn and profit from manpower skill training. Staff and instructors should not be allowed to excuse themselves by blaming their failure to teach on the trainees' limited ability to learn. As long as the trainees have the ability and willingness to learn (or the data indicate they do), it is the instructor's job to learn how to teach them and the administrators to see that it is done. Likewise, language differences interfere only because of the limited ability of some minority trainees to communicate and understand in English. This is true of only a small proportion of all minority trainees and when it is true, it is the program's responsibility to provide English as a second language (ESL) training to make skills acquirement and employability possible. Nonstandard English may "turn off" instructors and potential employers, but it does not interfere with learning ability.

This basic finding should also be generally disseminated to actual and potential manpower trainees, as well as those who may tend to use their supposed nontrainability as an excuse to justify their fears of undertaking training in unfamiliar circumstances.

2. Materials should be prepared and staff training provided to familiarize instructors, administrators, and other staff of training institutions of cultural differences which may lead them to misconceptions about the abilities and responses of their trainees.

"Sensitivity training" is not enough. It is helpful to alert staff members to the need to be tolerant of individual and group differences. However, that is no substitute for knowing enough about specific culture and language differences and learning styles of trainees to recognize how trainee response to various teaching techniques will be affected. Administrators should be made cognizant of various holidays and family occasions important to various minorities and taught to be sufficiently flexible to give those equal recognition with the standard holiday. Audio-visual and written materials should be prepared at the national level and made available to all training centers and AMIDS (Area Manpower Institute for the Development of Staff) to alert staff to specific variables.

3. All criteria used to assign individuals among various occupational offerings in training programs should be examined under national office direction to assure that misconceptions about trainee ability and the relevance of various criteria to job

performance do not arbitrarily exclude any with a reasonable chance of job success.

If, for instance, a high school diploma is assumed to be a minimum requirement for entrance into training for a particular occupation, that may serve as an absolute bar to entrance of members of a minority group which produces few high school graduates. The criterion must be ability to perform satisfactorily on the job, and training center staff should accept part of the responsibility of convincing employers to drop irrelevant selection criteria.

4. Wherever possible, competent staff should be drawn from the same racial and ethnic groups as the majority of enrollees.

This increases the likelihood of understanding and may also provide role models. Socioeconomic status was found to be a more powerful obstacle to training success than cultural attributes which follow racial lines but cross socioeconomic ones. Therefore, those selecting staff must recognize that a staff member or instructor of the same race or ethnic origin but from a different socioeconomic strata may be no more alert to cultural differences than members of the majority population would be. While being a member of a minority group may increase an individual's chances of being disadvantaged or even may be the primary cause of it, it is still the socioeconomic disadvantage which is most likely to cause training difficulties. This fact must enter into staff training, as well as into staff selection.

5. Discrimination, overt and institutional, remains a serious problem in training, as well as employment, and must be rooted out.

The implication was strong throughout this study, as among others, that discrimination, both overt and institutional, remains the primary cause of the socioeconomic status which affects a minority group as a whole or the negative response of training center staffs. It is the responsibility of every administrator of manpower policy and program at national, state,and local levels to eliminate every vestige of racial and ethnic discrimination within their jurisdiction. For that which impacts upon program from outside their jurisdiction, they can only compensate.

6. The following recommendations result from the hypotheses drawn by the study regarding the language problems of trainees:

a. A review of existing ESL materials to determine which are most useful for addressing the language problems of trainees.

b. Elimination of all child-oriented materials and development of stimulating materials at an adult level of interest.

c. The development of new, or the modification of already existing ESL materials to create a focus on the particular bilingual needs of chicano and native American trainees. Much of the existing material was developed with a European or an Eastern bias.

d. The provision in training programs of sufficient time and resources for filling the remedial needs of trainees in speaking and writing English. With such support both their level of performance in training and their likelihood of finding employment after training will improve.

7. The following recommendations result from the hypotheses drawn by the study regarding the dominant culture's lack of awareness of actual cultural differences and their sometimes casual acceptance of racial stereotypes:

a. Program and curriculum developers should give lower priority to adapting programs and materials to the cultural characteristics of minority groups and more to preparing instructors to recognize and deal with differing responses. Except in specific instances that are noted in this report, cultural characteristics simply do not have that much influence on trainee performance. Such efforts should instead be focused on developing staff training and orientation programs aimed at the elimination of stereotypes and misperceptions, and at making staff aware of those actual cultural characteristics that do exist.

b. Selection and assignment procedures should be assessed and adjusted to weed out any personal or structural discrimination that limits the occupational range available to trainees.

c. Textbooks and other material should be selected which give equal prominence to minority group members in illustrations and examples.

d. Staff training programs should be developed which focus on the elimination of stereotypes and which make staff aware of the actual cultural characteristics of nondominant population group members that are relevant to the training situation.

e. Tests and measurements that do not have built-in cultural or language biases should be developed.

f. An overall framework that is bicultural should be developed and applied to every aspect of training programs. The goal of absorbing minorities into the dominant culture is no longer accepted as legitimate without considerable qualification, and the success of any program with minority groups rests in part on the recognition by program developers, administrators, and instructors of the necessity and value of the trainees' culture. If the minority trainee is accepted as significant -- as something more than a passive problem for the dominant culture to "solve" -- then his culture too must be accepted as significant and must be an integral part of any program that respects him, any program in which he has a real chance of developing self-respect, responsibility, and success.

g. In order to achieve an accurate bicultural program framework, concrete policies should be devised which would involve minority trainees and others in various aspects of the development of training programs. The "user input" is an absolutely necessary component in the success of any training program.

8. The following recommendations result from the hypotheses drawn by the study regarding the effects of the discrimination, economic, and social deprivation, and the narrow range of experience that characterizes the lives of many minority group members.

a. A concrete analysis of the actual obstacles to employment of trainees should be undertaken, and it should have a twofold focus. On the one hand, it should assess the obstacles that result from the trainee's own experience, such as level of education, breadth of experience, language problems, etc. On the other hand, it should assess the external obstacles that the trainee may encounter, such as racial discrimination, employer attitudes toward manpower training programs, hiring practices, complexity of job-seeking procedures, etc.

b. Open-ended materials should be developed for use by minority trainees, with a focus on improving the self-image of trainees.

c. Career education materials should be developed and used as a part of the orientation of every trainee. It is important that a trainee have a clear understanding of the full range of occupational choices available to him.

d. Job training programs should develop and use detailed information on specific requirements and duties that trainees will encounter in their occupation in the specific labor market into which they will be entering after they complete training. Any other specific information about their particular labor market that might be of use to them should also be made available to them.

e. Support services for trainees should be assessed to determine how well they meet trainee needs, and should be improved and increased where a need is identified. In view of the apparent influence of trainees' socioeconomic environment on their performance in training, this is a particularly important area of concern.

f. A full remedial education program should be developed that focuses on the specific needs of the various subgroups of the nondominant population groups covered in this study. It is also recommended that the training cycle be modified to allow time for the inclusion of this remedial work in a trainee's program.

9. A final recommendation is that a study or project that has as its goal the development of actual materials or programs should focus on populations that are more specific than an entire culture group. The unique cultural, linguistic, social, political,

and geographical configuration of the smallest target population that it is feasible to single out should be the basis for any such projects. Projects with a more general basis should attempt to include in their products mechanisms for modifying them to meet the needs of the more specific target populations.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX A

# SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRES

# QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BLACKS

Section I

☐ A ☐ C ☐ CS ☐ O ☐ O1 ☐ PG

Culture-Language Variables

Date: ______________________

Interviewer: ______________________

Name of Agency ______________________

Address ______________________

Telephone Number ______________________

Contact Person ______________________

Position of Contact ______________________

Skill Center ☐ Multi ☐

Other (CAA, OIC, etc.) ☐

## Culture-Language Variables Research

### Introduction

The purpose of this research project is to identify those factors of culture and language which affect the occupational aspirations, training, and success of the least assimilated Black population group members.

These questions relate to those trainees who exhibit strong or fairly strong cultural and linguistic features that you associate as being characteristic of the Black population.

Which of the following do you consider cultural features of your Black trainees?

______ 1. extended family (ties with members outside of the parent-child family unit)

______ 2. close family ties and family interdependence

______ 3. achievement for the family rather than individually oriented

______ 4. father head of the family

______ 5. male dominance (authoritarian figure)

______ 6. mother: center of spiritual and affective cohesiveness of family

______ 6.5. female subservience

______ 7 ghetto style of residence and life

______ 8. achievement oriented toward the community, the ethnic group

______ 9. more co-operatively oriented than competitively oriented

______ 10. monolingual speakers of a dialect

______ 11. bilingual (e.g., dialect/English)

______ 12. free of anxiety in their attitude toward time

______ 13. undependable in time structured situation

______ 14. strong religious feelings and affiliations

______ 15. superstitious in their beliefs

Are there any other cultural features of your trainees which the preceding list overlooks. Please specify:

1. ________________________________________

2. ________________________________________

3. ________________________________________

4. ________________________________________

5. ________________________________________

## Section II

In respect to your Black trainees, do you perceive that their family structures and values affect:

2.0 Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

2.1 The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.2 The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.3 The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

## Section III

In respect to your Black trainees, do you perceive that their ghetto style of residence and life affects:

3.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages them
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages them

3.1 The trainees' occupational preference
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.2 The trainees' attendance
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.3 The trainees' dropout rate
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

## Section IV Language

A. How do you perceive lack of proficiency in speaking standard English to affect the Black trainees':

4.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.1 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.2 The trainees' rate of progress within the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.3 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.4 The trainees' relationship with program personnel

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.5 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.6 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

B. How do you feel the use of dialect in occupational training would affect:

4.7 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.8 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.9 The trainees' rate of progress within the program:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.10 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.11 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.12 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.13 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

Section IV

C. Do you think that your Black trainees should be taught occupational skills in his dialect and taught English/as a separate skill/necessary to function in a job situation?

A. Yes____ b. No____

Please state why:

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

## Section V General

5.0 Do your Black trainees show a great preference for training in manual skills?

____Yes ____No

5.1 To what degree would you attribute this preference to the language and culture of the trainees?

____ a. To a large degree

____ b. To a minor degree

____ c. To no degree at all

5.2 Do you perceive your Black trainees' religious beliefs and affiliations play a significant role in their participation in the training process?

____ a. Yes, in a positive manner

____ b. Yes, in a negative manner

____ c. Plays no role at all

5.3 Do you perceive that socio-economic and political factors beyond the control of the group the Black trainee belongs to have significant influence on his occupational outlook with respect to:

Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them

____ b. Moderately discourages

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately encourages them

____ e. Greatly encourages

The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

5.4 How do you perceive the outside socio-economic and political factors to compare in importance with the cultural and language features of the Black trainee.

____ a. Of most importance in a positive manner
____ b. Of most importance in a negative manner
____ c. Equal in importance
____ d. Less important than cultural and language features in a negative manner
____ e. Less important in a positive manner

COMMENTS

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

# QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING

Section I

☐ A ☐ C ☐ CS ☐ O ☐ O1 ☐ PG

Culture-Language Variables

Date: ____________________

Interviewer: ____________________

Name of Agency ____________________

Address ____________________

Telephone Number ____________________

Contact Person ____________________

Position of Contact ____________________

Skill Center ☐ Multi ☐

Other (CAA, OIC, etc.) ☐

## Culture-Language Variables Research

### Introduction

The purpose of this research project is to identify those factors of culture and language which affect the occupational aspirations, training, and success of the least assimilated Spanish-speaking population group members.

These questions relate to those trainees who exhibit strong or fairly strong cultural and linguistic features that you associate as being characteristic of the Spanish-speaking population.

Which of the following do you consider cultural features of your Spanish-speaking trainees?

______ 1. extended family (ties with members outside of the parent-child family unit)

______ 2. close family ties and family interdependence

______ 3. achievement for the family rather than individually oriented

______ 4. father head of the family

______ 5. male dominance (authoritarian figure)

______ 6. mother: center of spiritual and affective cohesiveness of family

______ 6.5. female subservience

______ 7. Barrio style of residence and life

______ 8. achievement oriented toward the community, the ethnic group

______ 9. more co-operatively oriented than competitively oriented

______ 10. monolingual speakers of Spanish

______ 11. bilingual (e.g., Spanish/English)

______ 12. free of anxiety in their attitude toward time

______ 13. undependable in time structured situations

______ 14. strong religious feelings and affiliations

______ 15. superstitious in their beliefs

Are there any other cultural features of your trainees wich the preceding list overlooks. Please specify:

1. ______________________________

2. ______________________________

3. ______________________________

4. ______________________________

5. ______________________________

## Section II

In respect to your Spanish-speaking trainees, do you perceive that their family structures and values affect:

2.0 Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

2.1 The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.2 The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.3 The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.9 The trainees' socio-economic values
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.10 The trainees' self-image
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

## Section III

In respect to your Spanish-speaking trainees, do you perceive that their barrio style of residence and life affects:

3.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll for training
____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages them
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages them

3.1 The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.2 The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.3 The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

## Section IV Language

A. How do you perceive lack of proficiency in speaking standard English to affect the Spanish-speaking trainees':

4.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.1 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.2 The trainees' rate of progress within the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.3 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program

____ a. Greatly

____ b. Moderately

____ c. Not at all

4.4 The trainees' relationship with program personnel

____ a. Greatly

____ b. Moderately

____ c. Not at all

4.5 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly

____ b. Moderately

____ c. Not at all

4.6 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly

____ b. Moderately

____ c. Not at all

B. How do you feel the use of native language in occupational training would affect:

4.7 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.8 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.9 The trainees' rate of progress within the program:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.10 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.11 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.12 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.13 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

Section IV

C. Do you think that your Spanish-speaking trainees should be taught occupational skills in his native language and taught English/as a separate skill/necessary to function in a job situation?

A. Yes____ b. No____

Please state why:

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Section V General

5.0 Do your Spanish-speaking trainees show a great preference for training in manual skills?

____Yes ____No

5.1 To what degree would you attribute this preference to the language and culture of the trainees?

____ a. To a large degree
____ b. To a minor degree
____ c. To no degree at all

5.2 Do you perceive your Spanish-speaking trainees' religious beliefs and affiliations play a significant role in their participation in the training process?

____ a. Yes, in a positive manner
____ b. Yes, in a negative manner
____ c. Plays no role at all

5.3 Do you perceive that socio-economic and political factors beyond the control of the group the Spanish-speaking trainee belongs to have significant influence on his occupational outlook with respect to:

Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' attendance
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' dropout rate
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' orientation to continuous employment
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

5.4 How do you perceive the outside socio-economic and political factors to compare in importance with the cultural and language features of the Spanish-speaking trainee.

____ a. Of most importance in a positive manner

____ b. Of most importance in a negative manner

____ c. Equal in importance

____ d. Less important than cultural and language features in a negative manner

____ e. Less important in a positive manner

COMMENTS

Please list any suggestions which you believe should be considered in the development of curriculum guides for Spanish-speaking trainees.

# QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIANS

Section I

☐ A ☐ C ☐ CS ☐ O ☐ O1 ☐ PG

## Culture-Language Variables

Date: ____________________

Interviewer: ____________________

Name of Agency ________________________________________

Address ________________________________________

Telephone Number ________________________________________

Contact Person ________________________________________

Position of Contact ________________________________________

Skill Center ☐ Multi ☐

Other (CAA, OIC, etc.) ☐

## Culture-Language Variables Research

### Introduction

The purpose of this research project is to identify those factors of culture and language which affect the occupational aspirations, training, and success of the least assimilated Indian population group members.

These questions relate to those trainees who exhibit strong or fairly strong cultural and linguistic features that you associate as being characteristic of the Indian population.

Which of the following do you consider cultural features of your Indian trainees?

______ 1. extended family (ties with members outside of the parent-child family unit)

______ 2. close family ties and family interdependence

______ 3. achievement for the family rather than individually oriented

______ 4. father head of the family

______ 5. male dominance (authoritarian figure)

______ 6. mother: center of spiritual and affective cohesiveness of family

______ 6.5. female subservience

______ 7. tribal style of residence and life

______ 8. achievement oriented toward the community, the ethnic group

______ 9. more co-operatively oriented than competitively oriented

______ 10. monolingual speakers of an Indian language

______ 11. bilingual (e.g., Indian language/English)

______ 12. free of anxiety in their attitude toward time

______ 13. undependable in time structured situations

______ 14. strong religious feelings and affiliations

______ 15. superstitious in their beliefs

Are there any other cultural features of your trainees which the preceding list overlooks. Please specify:

1. ______________________________

2. ______________________________

3. ______________________________

4. ______________________________

5. ______________________________

## Section II

In respect to your Indian trainees, do you perceive that their family structures and values affect:

2.0 Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

2.1 The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.2 The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.3 The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner

____ b. Moderately in a positive manner

____ c. Neutral (has no influence)

____ d. Moderately in a negative manner

____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

## Section III

In respect to your Indian trainees, do you perceive that their tribal style of residence and life affects:

3.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages them
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages them

3.1 The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.2 The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.3 The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

## Section IV Language

A. How do you perceive lack of proficiency in speaking standard English to affect the Indian trainees':

4.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.1 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.2 The trainees' rate of progress within the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.3 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.4 The trainees' relationship with program personnel

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.5 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.6 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

B. How do you feel the use of native language in occupational training would affect:

4.7 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.8 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in:
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.9 The trainees' rate of progress within the program:
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.10 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.11 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.12 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

4.13 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

Section IV

C. Do you think that your Indian trainees should be taught occupational skills in his native language and taught English/as a separate skill/necessary to function in a job situation:

A. Yes____ b. No____

Please state why:

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

## Section V General

5.0 Do your Indian trainees show a great preference for training in manual skills?

____Yes ____No

5.1 To what degree would you attribute this preference to the language and culture of the trainees?

____ a. To a large degree
____ b. To a minor degree
____ c. To no degree at all

5.2 Do you perceive your Indian trainees' religious beliefs and affiliations play a significant role in their participation in the training process?

____ a. To a large degree
____ b. To a minor degree
____ c. To no degree at all

5.3 Do you perceive that socio-economic and political factors beyond the control of the group the Indian trainee belongs to have significant influence on his occupational outlook with respect to:

Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

5.4 How do you perceive the outside socio-economic and political factors to compare in importance with the cultural and language features of the Indian trainee.

____ a. Of most importance in a positive manner
____ b. Of most importance in a negative manner
____ c. Equal in importance
____ d. Less important than cultural and language features in a negative manner
____ e. Less important in a positive manner

COMMENTS

# QUESTIONNAIRE FOR APPALACHIAN WHITES

Section I

☐ A　☐ C　☐ CS　☐ O　☐ O1　☐ PG

Culture-Language Variables

Date: ____________________

Interviewer: ____________________

Name of Agency ____________________________________

Address ____________________________________

Telephone Number ____________________________________

Contact Person ____________________________________

Position of Contact ____________________________________

Skill Center ☐　Multi ☐

Other (CAA, OIC, etc.) ☐

## Culture-Language Variables Research

## Introduction

The purpose of this research project is to identify those factors of culture and language which affect the occupational aspirations, training, and success of the Appalachian population group members.

These questions relate to those trainees who exhibit strong or fairly strong cultural and linguistic features that you associate as being characteristic of the Appalachian population.

Which of the following do you consider cultural features of your Appalachian trainees?

______ 1. extended family (ties with members outside of the parent-child family unit)

______ 2. close family ties and family interdependence

______ 3. achievement for the family rather than individually oriented

______ 4. father head of the family

______ 5. male dominance (authoritarian figure)

______ 6. mother: center of spiritual and affective cohesiveness of family

______ 6.5. female subservience

______ 7. rural style of residence and life

______ 8. achievement oriented toward the community, the local group

______ 9. more co-operatively oriented than competitively oriented

______ 10. speakers of an "Appalachian" dialect

______ 11. bilingual

______ 12. free of anxiety in their attitude toward time

______ 13. undependable in time structured situations

______ 14. strong religious feelings and affiliations

______ 15. superstitious in their beliefs

Are there any other cultural features of your trainees which the preceding list overlooks. Please specify:

1. ________________________________________
2. ________________________________________
3. ________________________________________
4. ________________________________________
5. ________________________________________

## Section II

In respect to your trainees, do you perceive that their family structures and values affect:

2.0 Their willingness to enroll for training
____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

2.1 The trainees' occupational preference
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.2 The trainees' attendance
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.3 The trainees' dropout rate
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

2.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

Section III

In respect to your trainees, do you perceive that their rural style of residence and life affects:

3.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages them
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages them

3.1 The trainees' occupational preference
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.2 The trainees' attendance
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.3 The trainees' dropout rate
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.4 The trainees' orientation to continuous employment
____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.5 The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.6 The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.7 The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators,
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.8 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.9 The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

3.10 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

Section IV Language

A. How do you perceive lack of proficiency in speaking standard English to affect the trainees':

4.0 The trainees' willingness to enroll

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.1 The trainees' preference of skill areas to be trained in

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.2 The trainees' rate of progress within the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.3 The trainees' level of vocational proficiency upon completion of the program

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.4 The trainees' relationship with program personnel

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.5 The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees:

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

4.6 The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly
____ b. Moderately
____ c. Not at all

Section V General

5.0 Do your trainees show a great preference for training in manual skills?

____Yes ____No

5.1 To what degree would you attribute this preference to the language and culture of the trainees?

____ a. To a large degree
____ b. To a minor degree
____ c. To no degree at all

5.2 Do you perceive your trainees' religious beliefs and affiliations play a significant role in their participation in the training process?

____ a. To a large degree
____ b. To a minor degree
____ c. To no degree at all

5.3 Do you perceive that socio-economic and political factors beyond the control of the group the trainee belongs to have significant influence on his occupational outlook with respect to:

Their willingness to enroll for training

____ a. Greatly discourages them
____ b. Moderately discourages
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately encourages them
____ e. Greatly encourages

The trainees' occupational preference

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no direct bearing on preference)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' attendance

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' dropout rate

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' orientation to continuous employment

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' setting of long and short-range goals

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' commitment to task completion

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with program personnel
Specify: 1-Administrators
2-Counselors and/or
3-Instructors

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' relationship with fellow trainees

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' socio-economic values

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

The trainees' self-image

____ a. Greatly in a positive manner
____ b. Moderately in a positive manner
____ c. Neutral (has no influence)
____ d. Moderately in a negative manner
____ e. Greatly in a negative manner

5.4 How do you perceive the outside socio-economic and political factors to compare in importance with the cultural and language features of the trainee.

____ a. Of most importance in a positive manner

____ b. Of most importance in a negative manner

____ c. Equal in importance

____ d. Less important than cultural and language features in a negative manner

____ e. Less important in a positive manner

COMMENTS

# SKILLS CENTERS AND OTHER TRAINING FACILITIES SURVEYED

## For Afro-American Concerns

1

Opportunities Industrialization Center, San Francisco, California

Opportunities Industrialization Center, Riverside, California

Community Skills Center, Gardena, California

Pacoima Skills Center, Pacoima, California

Watts Skills Center, Los Angeles, California

Multi Skills Center, San Diego, California

J.F.K. Center for Vocational Education, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Opportunities Industrialization Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Opportunities Industrialization Center, Cincinnati, Ohio

Stowe Adult Center, Cincinnati, Ohio

Opportunities Industrialization Center, New Haven, Connecticut

Hartford MDTA Skills Center, Hartford, Connecticut

Jersey City, MDTA Skills Center, Jersey City, New Jersey

Newark Manpower Skills Center, Newark, New Jersey

Mercer MDTA Skills Center, Trenton, New Jersey

Camden MDTA Skills Center, Camden, New Jersey

Miami Skills Center, Miami, Florida

Atlanta Manpower Skills Center, Atlanta, Georgia

Wilmington Manpower Skills Center, Wilmington, Delaware

Indianapolis Skills Center, Indianapolis, Indiana

Memphis MDTA Skills Center, Memphis, Tennessee

MDTA Educational Center, Providence, Rhode Island

For Chicano Concerns

East Los Angeles Skills Center, Los Angeles, California

United Community Efforts, Los Angeles, California

Pacoima Skills Center, Pacoima, California

North Valley Occupational Center, San Fernando, California

Stockton MDTA Skills Center, Stockton, California

Napa College MDTA Program, Napa, California

San Hidalgo Institute, Oakland, California

Operation SER (Service Employment Redevelopment) Center, West Pico Boulevard, Los Angeles, California

Operation SER, Norwalk, Los Angeles, California

Operation SER Center, Santa Ana, California

National City Operation SER Center, San Diego, California

San Diego Skills Center, San Diego, California

CEP (Concentrated Employment Program) Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Albuquerque Skills Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico

CEP Center, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Operation SER Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Albuquerque Technical-Vocational School, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Camp Luna Vocational Center, New Mexico

Northern New Mexico Technical-Vocational School, New Mexico

Maricopa County Skills Center, Phoenix, Arizona

Job Corps Center, Phoenix, Arizona

OIC (Opportunities Industrialization Center), Phoenix, Arizona

Guadalupe Community Adult School, Guadalupe, Arizona

SER/CEP Center, Phoenix, Arizona

Operation SER Center, Tuscon, Arizona

Tuscon Skills Center, Tuscon, Arizona

Operation SER Center, El Paso, Texas

El Paso Community College Vocational School, El Paso, Texas

San Antonio Skills Center, San Antonio, Texas

Operation SER Center, San Antonio, Texas

For Native American Concerns

Gita River Career Center, Sacton, Arizona

Southwest Indian Youth Center, Mount Lemon, Arizona

Navajo Community College, Chinle, Arizona

Fort Defiance Skills Center, Fort Defiance, Arizona

Maricopa County Skills Center, Phoenix, Arizona

Navajo Farm Enterprises, Shiprock, New Mexico

Roswell Employment Training Center, Roswell, New Mexico

New Mexico Technical-Vocational Institute, Española, New Mexico

Institute of American Indian Arts, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Bacone College, Muckogee, Oklahoma

Oklahoma State Technical School, Okmulgee, Oklahoma

Community College of Denver, Denver, Colorado

Madera Employment Training Center, Madera, California

For Appalachian White Concerns

Morristown State Area Vocational School, Morristown, Tennessee

Livingston Area Vocational School, Livingston, Tennessee

Crossville Area Vocational School, Crossville, Tennessee

Harriman MDTA Skills Center, Harriman, Tennessee

McDowell Technical Institute, Marion, North Carolina

Southwest Technical Institute, Sylva, North Carolina

Tri-County Technical Institute, Murphy, North Carolina

Mercer County Vocational Technical Center, Princeton, West Virginia

Wyoming County Vocational Technical Center, Pineville, West Virginia

Raleigh County Vocational Technical Center, Beckley, West Virginia

Wise County Manpower Center, Wise, Virginia

Washington Manpower Training Skills Center, Abingdon, Virginia

Harlan Area Vocational School, Harlan, Kentucky

# APPENDIX B

# STATISTICAL SUMMARIES

## ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

| Population Group | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 33 | | | | 62 |
| Spanish Speaking | 5 | 40 | 1 | | 26 |
| American Indian | 1 | 4 | 4 | | 12 |
| Appalachian White | 1 | | | 66 | |
| Total | 40 | 45[a] | 5 | 66 | 100[b] |

[a] One did not respond.

[b] Six did not respond.

Total Population Sample

## CULTURAL FEATURES

### Extended Family

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 47.5 | 52.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 73.3 | 25.7 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 35.8 | 64.2 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 44.8 | 55.2 |

### Close Family Ties-Family Interdependence

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 45.0 | 55.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 84.4 | 15.6 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 56.7 | 43.3 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 50.6 | 49.4 |

## Family Rather than Individually Oriented Achievement

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 12.5 | 87.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 37.8 | 62.2 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 19.4 | 80.6 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 19.2 | 80.8 |

## Female Subservience

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 17.5 | 82.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 35.6 | 64.4 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 28.4 | 71.6 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 25.6 | 74.4 |

## Style of Residence and Life (ghetto, barrio, tribal or rural)

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 67.5 | 32.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 68.9 | 31.1 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 71.6 | 28.4 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 66.9 | 33.1 |

## Community or Ethnic Group Oriented Achievement

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 10.0 | 90.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 28.9 | 71.1 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 20.9 | 79.1 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 25.6 | 74.4 |

## Father Head of Family

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 55.6 | 44.4 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 41.8 | 58.2 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 30.2 | 69.8 |

## Male Dominance (authoritarian figure)

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 30.0 | 70.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 71.1 | 28.9 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 31.3 | 68.7 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 26.7 | 73.3 |

## Mother: Center of Spiritual and Affective Cohesiveness of Family

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 68.9 | 31.1 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 38.8 | 61.2 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 54.7 | 45.3 |

## More co-operatively Oriented than Competitively Oriented

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 57.8 | 42.2 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 37.3 | 62.7 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 35.5 | 64.5 |

## Monolingual Speakers of a Dialect

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 26.7 | 73.3 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians |  | 100.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 53.7 | 46.3 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 31.4 | 68.6 |

## Bilingual

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 73.3 | 26.7 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 3.0 | 97.0 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 30.8 | 69.2 |

## Free of Anxiety in their Attitude Toward Time

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 44.4 | 55.6 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 41.8 | 58.2 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 40.7 | 59.3 |

## Undependable in Time Structured Situations

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 32.8 | 67.2 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 36.6 | 63.4 |

## Strong Religious Feelings and Affiliations

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 22.5 | 77.5 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 62.2 | 37.8 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 40.0 | 60.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 41.8 | 58.2 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 36.6 | 63.4 |

## Superstitious in their Beliefs

| Population Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Questionnaires for Blacks | 15.0 | 85.0 |
| Questionnaires for Spanish Speaking | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Questionnaires for American Indians | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Questionnaires for Appalachian Whites | 26.9 | 73.1 |
| Questionnaires for Others | 26.7 | 73.3 |

# THE EFFECT OF FAMILY STRUCTURE AND VALUES

## Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Discourages | 5.0 | 6.7 |  | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Moderately Discourages | 17.5 | 22.2 | 20.0 | 29.9 | 26.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 7.5 | 12.2 |
| Moderately Encourages | 45.0 | 44.4 | 60.0 | 50.7 | 45.9 |
| Greatly Encourages | 20.0 | 8.9 |  | 6.0 | 8.1 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 4.4 |  | 3.0 | 4.7 |

## Occupational Preference

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 25.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 6.0 | 11.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 45.0 | 48.9 | 60.0 | 52.2 | 46.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 15.0 | 20.0 |  | 20.9 | 22.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 10.0 | 17.8 | 20.0 | 16.4 | 14.5 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 |  |  | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 4.4 |  | 3.0 | 3.5 |

## Attendance

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 8.9 | | 7.5 | 8.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 35.0 | 31.1 | | 38.8 | 28.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 15.0 | 8.9 | 40.0 | 10.4 | 12.2 |
| Moderately Negative | 12.5 | 33.3 | 60.0 | 35.8 | 41.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 15.0 | 15.6 | | 4.5 | 7.0 |
| No Response | | 2.2 | | 3.0 | 2.9 |

## Dropout Rate

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 10.0 | 6.7 | | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 32.5 | 8.9 | 40.0 | 26.9 | 25.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 20.0 | | 20.9 | 18.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 46.7 | 60.0 | 37.3 | 40.1 |
| Greatly Negative | 12.5 | 13.3 | | 6.0 | 8.7 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 4.4 | | 4.5 | 4.1 |

## Orientation to Continuous Employment

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 20.0 | 20.0 | | 14.9 | 14.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 47.5 | 35.6 | 100.00 | 47.8 | 37.8 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 5.0 | 8.9 | | 4.5 | 8.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 17.5 | 28.9 | | 22.4 | 30.8 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.0 | 2.2 | | 7.5 | 4.7 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 4.4 | | 3.0 | 4.7 |

## Setting of Long and Short-range Goals

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 17.5 | 4.4 | | 11.9 | 8.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 42.5 | 37.8 | 20.0 | 31.3 | 37.8 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 13.3 | 60.0 | 11.9 | 16.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 17.5 | 28.9 | 20.0 | 25.4 | 23.8 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 11.1 | | 14.9 | 8.7 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 4.4 | | 4.5 | 4.1 |

## Commitment to Task Completion

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 11.1 | | 7.5 | 5.8 |
| Moderately Positive | 45.0 | 28.9 | 80.0 | 44.8 | 40.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 17.8 | | 16.4 | 22.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 28.9 | 20.0 | 19.4 | 22.1 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 | 6.7 | | 6.0 | 4.7 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 6.7 | | 6.0 | 5.2 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 20.0 | | 9.0 | 9.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 17.5 | 37.8 | 40.0 | 23.9 | 21.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 15.0 | 13.3 | 40.0 | 17.9 | 19.8 |
| Moderately Negative | 10.0 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 16.4 | 19.2 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.5 | 2.2 | | 3.0 | 5.2 |
| No Response | 27.5 | 13.3 | | 29.9 | 24.4 |

## Relationship with Counselors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 6.7 |  | 6.0 | 10.5 |
| Moderately Positive | 35.0 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 13.4 | 21.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 10.0 | 4.4 | 40.0 | 9.0 | 13.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 7.5 | 4.4 |  | 9.0 | 8.7 |
| Greatly Negative |  | 2.2 |  | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| No Response | 25.0 | 71.1 | 20.0 | 61.2 | 44.8 |

## Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 35.0 | 8.9 |  | 9.0 | 17.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 32.5 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 20.9 | 23.8 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 10.0 | 4.4 | 40.0 | 14.9 | 18.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 5.0 | 4.4 |  | 10.4 | 8.1 |
| Greatly Negative |  |  |  | 4.5 | 1.7 |
| No Response | 17.5 | 71.1 | 20.0 | 40.3 | 30.8 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 37.5 | 31.1 | 20.0 | 10.4 | 18.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 32.5 | 33.3 | 60.0 | 49.3 | 45.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 17.5 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 19.4 | 18.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 10.0 | 8.9 |  | 17.9 | 11.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 |  |  |  | 1.2 |
| No Response |  | 6.7 |  | 3.0 | 4.7 |

## Socio-economic Values

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 10.4 | 12.2 |
| Moderately Positive | 42.5 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 40.3 | 39.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 6.0 | 6.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 12.5 | 33.3 | 20.0 | 32.8 | 31.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 8.9 | | 6.0 | 4.1 |
| No Response | 7.5 | 6.7 | | 4.5 | 6.4 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 30.0 | 13.3 | 30.0 | 13.4 | 13.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 42.5 | 28.9 | 40.0 | 31.3 | 33.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 2.5 | 11.1 | 20.0 | 10.4 | 9.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 32.8 | 33.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.0 | 2.2 | | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| No Response | | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 6.4 |

# THE EFFECT OF STYLE OF RESIDENCE AND LIFE

## Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Discourages | 20.0 | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 8.7 |
| Moderately Discourages | 32.5 | 55.6 | | 35.8 | 39.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 2.5 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 9.9 |
| Moderately Encourages | 22.5 | 15.6 | 80.0 | 29.9 | 32.6 |
| Greatly Encourages | 22.5 | 4.4 | | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| No Response | | 6.7 | | 6.0 | 5.8 |

## Occupational Preference

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 32.5 | 6.7 | | 14.9 | 12.8 |
| Moderately Positive | 20.0 | 33.3 | 80.0 | 31.3 | 34.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 15.0 | 11.1 | | 25.4 | 16.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 35.6 | 20.0 | 13.4 | 23.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.5 | 6.7 | | 6.0 | 6.4 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 6.7 | | 9.0 | 6.4 |

## Attendance

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 8.9 | | 6.0 | 4.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.5 | 22.2 | 20.0 | 35.8 | 23.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 13.4 | 10.5 |
| Moderately Negative | 32.5 | 37.8 | 40.0 | 37.3 | 45.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 17.5 | 15.6 | | 1.5 | 12.2 |
| No Response | | 4.4 | | 6.0 | 4.1 |

## Dropout Rate

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 12.5 | 6.7 | | 6.0 | 4.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 15.0 | 8.9 | 40.0 | 20.9 | 13.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 17.8 | | 31.3 | 20.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 26.9 | 42.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 27.5 | 13.3 | | 4.5 | 12.2 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 13.3 | | 10.4 | 6.4 |

## Orientation to Continuous Employment

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 8.9 | | 13.4 | 7.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 30.0 | 28.9 | 20.0 | 31.3 | 23.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 10.0 | 15.6 | 40.0 | 13.4 | 10.5 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.0 | 28.9 | 40.0 | 28.4 | 42.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 11.1 | | 4.5 | 9.9 |
| No Response | | 6.7 | | 9.0 | 6.4 |

## Setting of Long and Short-range Goals

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 12.5 | 2.2 | | 10.4 | 8.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 37.5 | 24.4 | 20.0 | 32.8 | 20.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 17.8 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 14.5 |
| Moderately Negative | 22.5 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 17.9 | 35.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 11.1 | | 11.9 | 12.8 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 4.4 | | 9.0 | 7.0 |

## Commitment to Task Completion

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 17.5 | 8.9 | | 7.5 | 7.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 37.5 | 22.2 | 40.0 | 38.8 | 25.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 17.8 | 20.0 | 22.4 | 18.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 32.5 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 14.9 | 37.2 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.0 | 2.2 | | 6.0 | 5.2 |
| No Response | | 8.9 | | 10.4 | 7.6 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 15.6 | 20.0 | 4.5 | 5.2 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.5 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 26.9 | 18.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 22.2 | | 9.0 | 12.8 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 31.1 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 23.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 2.2 | | 4.5 | 7.6 |
| No Response | 20.0 | 8.9 | | 37.3 | 33.1 |

## Relationship with Counselors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 20.0 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 3.0 | 6.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 32.5 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 20.9 | 19.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 2.5 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 1.5 | 8.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 17.5 | 8.9 |  | 7.5 | 15.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 |  |  | 1.5 | .6 |
| No Response | 25.0 | 66.7 | 20.0 | 65.7 | 50.0 |

## Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 25.0 | 4.4 | 20.0 | 6.0 | 11.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 30.0 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 26.9 | 24.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 10.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 10.0 | 6.7 |  | 10.4 | 15.1 |
| Greatly Negative |  |  |  | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| No Response | 25.0 | 68.9 | 20.0 | 46.3 | 36.6 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 50.0 | 31.1 | 40.0 | 14.9 | 18.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.0 | 28.9 | 40.0 | 49.3 | 42.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 26.7 |  | 14.9 | 14.5 |
| Moderately Negative | 17.5 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 13.4 | 15.7 |
| Greatly Negative |  |  |  |  | 1.7 |
| No Response |  | 4.4 |  | 7.5 | 7.6 |

Socio-economic Values

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 12.5 | 6.7 | | 9.0 | 9.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 30.0 | 15.6 | 80.0 | 47.8 | 30.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 13.3 | | 7.5 | 9.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 32.5 | 42.2 | 20.0 | 19.4 | 32.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 12.5 | 8.9 | | 6.0 | 8.7 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 13.3 | | 10.4 | 8.7 |

Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 15.6 | 20.0 | 11.9 | 10.5 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.5 | 17.8 | 40.0 | 35.8 | 23.8 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.5 | 13.3 | | 14.9 | 11.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.0 | 44.4 | 40.0 | 23.9 | 36.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.5 | 6.7 | | 1.5 | 8.7 |
| No Response | | 2.2 | | 11.9 | 9.3 |

# LANGUAGE

## Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 22.5 | 24.4 | 20.0 | 6.0 | 15.1 |
| Moderate | 40.0 | 51.1 | 40.0 | 46.3 | 42.4 |
| None | 37.5 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 40.3 | 35.5 |
| No Response | | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 7.0 |

## Preference of Skill Areas

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 37.5 | 26.7 | 40.0 | 14.9 | 19.8 |
| Moderate | 37.5 | 55.6 | 60.0 | 49.3 | 48.8 |
| None | 22.5 | 13.3 | | 28.4 | 26.2 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 5.2 |

## Rate of Progress

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 30.0 | 31.1 | 40.0 | 29.9 | 30.8 |
| Moderate | 57.5 | 57.8 | 60.0 | 46.3 | 45.3 |
| None | 12.5 | 6.7 |  | 17.9 | 18.6 |
| No Response |  | 4.4 |  | 6.0 | 5.2 |

## Vocational Proficiency upon Completion of Program

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 25.0 | 28.9 | 20.0 | 20.9 | 25.0 |
| Moderate | 45.0 | 55.6 | 60.0 | 58.2 | 50.0 |
| None | 25.0 | 11.1 | 20.0 | 13.4 | 19.2 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 4.4 |  | 7.5 | 5.8 |

## Relationship with Program Personnel

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 12.5 | 11.1 |  | 7.5 | 12.8 |
| Moderate | 45.0 | 55.6 | 80.0 | 49.3 | 43.6 |
| None | 40.0 | 31.1 | 20.0 | 37.3 | 39.0 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 2.2 |  | 6.0 | 4.7 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 17.5 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 11.9 | 7.6 |
| Moderate | 25.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 26.9 | 32.6 |
| None | 57.5 | 42.2 | 60.0 | 53.7 | 54.7 |
| No Response | | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 5.2 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 20.0 | 24.4 | 40.0 | 14.9 | 19.8 |
| Moderate | 55.0 | 57.8 | 60.0 | 49.3 | 46.6 |
| None | 25.0 | 13.3 | | 29.9 | 28.6 |
| No Response | | 4.4 | | 6.0 | 5.2 |

## GENERAL WORK ETHICS AND BELIEFS

### Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 35.6 | 40.0 | | 11.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 47.5 | 37.8 | | | 17.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 15.6 | 20.0 | | 19.2 |
| Moderately Negative | 5.0 | 4.4 | 40.0 | | 7.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.5 | 2.2 | | | 2.3 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 4.4 | | | 42.4 |

### Preference of Skill Areas

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 25.0 | 33.3 | 20.0 | | 7.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 40.0 | 28.9 | 60.0 | | 20.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 22.2 | | | 21.5 |
| Moderately Negative | 7.5 | 6.7 | 20.0 | | 4.7 |
| Greatly Negative | | 2.2 | | | 3.5 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 6.7 | | | 43.0 |

## Rate of Progress

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 31.1 | 20.0 | | 10.5 |
| Moderately Positive | 45.0 | 35.6 | 60.0 | | 21.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 20.0 | 11.1 | | | 12.2 |
| Moderately Negative | 5.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | | 9.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 | 6.7 | | | 2.3 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 6.7 | | | 43.6 |

## Vocational Proficiency upon Completion of Program

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 20.0 | 28.9 | 20.0 | | 7.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 55.0 | 35.6 | 40.0 | | 19.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 10.0 | 11.1 | 20.0 | | 16.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 5.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | | 10.5 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.0 | 6.7 | | | 4.1 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 8.9 | | | 43.0 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 28.9 | | | 8.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.5 | 24.4 | 60.0 | | 14.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 17.8 | 20.0 | | 15.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 7.5 | 8.9 | 20.0 | | 7.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 | 2.2 | | | .6 |
| No Response | 17.5 | 17.8 | | | 53.5 |

## Relationship with Counselors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 30.0 | 11.1 | | | 9.3 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.0 | 13.3 | 40.0 | | 12.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 2.2 | 20.0 | | 13.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 7.5 | 4.4 | 20.0 | | 3.5 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | | .6 |
| No Response | 25.0 | 68.9 | 20.0 | | 61.0 |

## Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 32.5 | 17.8 | | | 8.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 17.5 | 8.9 | 40.0 | | 13.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 20.0 | 2.2 | 20.0 | | 16.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 2.5 | 4.4 | 20.0 | | 5.2 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | | .6 |
| No Response | 27.5 | 66.7 | 20.0 | | 55.8 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 25.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | | 8.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 40.0 | 28.9 | 40.0 | | 19.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 25.0 | 35.6 | | | 24.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 5.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | | 4.1 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | | 1.2 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 6.7 | | | 43.0 |

Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 25.0 | 28.9 | 20.0 | | 12.2 |
| Moderately Positive | 42.5 | 31.1 | 40.0 | | 20.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 17.5 | 20.0 | | | 11.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 7.5 | 6.7 | 40.0 | | 13.4 |
| Greatly Negative | | 2.2 | | | |
| No Response | 7.5 | 11.1 | | | 43.0 |

Should trainees be taught occupational skill in his dialect and taught English/as a separate skill/necessary to function in a job situation?

| Population Group | 0 | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 5.0 | 37.5 | 57.5 |
| Spanish Speaking | 8.9 | 35.6 | 55.6 |
| American Indian | | | 100.0 |
| Appalachian White | | | |
| Other | 42.4 | 12.8 | 44.8 |

Preference for training in manual skills

| Population Group | 0 | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 7.5 | 65.0 | 27.5 |
| Spanish Speaking | 11.1 | 62.2 | 26.7 |
| American Indian | | 100.0 | |
| Appalachian White | 6.0 | 74.6 | 19.4 |
| Other | 8.7 | 66.4 | 25.0 |

Preference to the Cultural and Language of the Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 52.5 | 51.1 | 80.0 | 41.8 | 36.0 |
| Moderate | 27.5 | 15.6 | 20.0 | 35.8 | 33.1 |
| None | 12.5 | 17.8 |  | 14.9 | 18.6 |
| No Response | 7.5 | 15.6 |  | 7.5 | 12.2 |

Do religious beliefs and affiliations play a significant role in their participation in the training process?

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 32.5 | 24.4 |  | 17.9 | 22.7 |
| Moderate | 12.5 | 4.4 | 40.0 | 28.4 | 14.5 |
| None | 55.0 | 66.7 | 60.0 | 49.3 | 55.8 |
| No Response |  | 4.4 |  | 4.5 | 7.0 |

# THE EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS

## Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Discourages | 20.0 | 2.2 |  | 9.0 | 10.5 |
| Moderately Discourages | 35.0 | 28.9 | 60.0 | 37.3 | 36.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 22.2 | 40.0 | 29.9 | 23.8 |
| Moderately Encourages | 25.0 | 13.3 |  | 17.9 | 19.2 |
| Greatly Encourages | 7.5 | 4.4 |  | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| No Response |  | 8.9 |  | 4.5 | 5.8 |

## Occupational Preference

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 15.0 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 9.0 | 7.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 35.0 | 24.4 | 40.0 | 22.4 | 23.8 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 15.0 | 22.2 |  | 34.3 | 26.2 |
| Moderately Negative | 15.0 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 25.4 | 30.2 |
| Greatly Negative | 17.5 | 6.7 |  | 4.5 | 5.2 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 6.7 |  | 4.5 | 7.0 |

## Attendance

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 12.5 | 2.2 | | 6.0 | 4.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 32.5 | 24.4 | 40.0 | 20.9 | 17.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 26.7 | 20.0 | 34.3 | 28.5 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 26.9 | 36.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 12.5 | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 7.6 |
| No Response | | 8.9 | | 4.5 | 5.8 |

## Dropout Rate

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 10.0 | | | 4.5 | 2.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.5 | 22.2 | 60.0 | 16.4 | 15.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 35.8 | 26.2 |
| Moderately Negative | 30.0 | 31.1 | 20.0 | 25.4 | 39.5 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 15.6 | | 9.0 | 9.3 |
| No Response | | 11.1 | | 9.0 | 7.0 |

## Orientation to Continuous Employment

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 17.5 | 8.9 | | 4.5 | 5.8 |
| Moderately Positive | 30.0 | 17.8 | 40.0 | 26.9 | 24.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 17.5 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 26.9 | 20.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 22.5 | 37.8 | 40.0 | 22.4 | 32.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 12.5 | 4.4 | | 10.4 | 9.9 |
| No Response | | 11.1 | | 9.0 | 7.6 |

## Setting of Long and Short-range Goals

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.5 | 11.1 | | 3.0 | 5.2 |
| Moderately Positive | 30.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 29.9 | 22.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 17.5 | 22.2 | 20.0 | 25.4 | 25.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 30.0 | 22.2 | 40.0 | 20.9 | 28.5 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.5 | 20.0 | | 11.9 | 11.0 |
| No Response | 7.5 | 4.4 | | 9.0 | 7.6 |

## Commitment to Task Completion

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 10.0 | 2.2 | | 9.0 | 7.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 32.5 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 25.4 | 20.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 20.0 | 22.2 | 60.0 | 25.4 | 25.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 27.5 | 37.8 | 20.0 | 23.9 | 30.8 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.5 | 4.4 | | 7.5 | 7.6 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 13.3 | | 9.0 | 9.3 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 10.0 | 11.1 | | 6.0 | 7.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 10.0 | 15.6 | 40.0 | 22.4 | 14.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 30.0 | 31.1 | 20.0 | 23.9 | 23.8 |
| Moderately Negative | 25.0 | 22.2 | 40.0 | 14.9 | 22.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 | | | 3.0 | 4.7 |
| No Response | 22.5 | 20.0 | | 29.9 | 27.3 |

### Relationship with Counselors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 12.5 | 6.7 | | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.5 | 8.9 | 40.0 | 16.4 | 16.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.5 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 9.0 | 14.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 20.0 | 2.2 | 20.0 | 6.0 | 15.7 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | 3.0 | 1.7 |
| No Response | 22.5 | 75.6 | 20.0 | 61.2 | 47.7 |

### Relationship with Instructor

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 10.0 | 4.4 | | 4.5 | 7.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.5 | 11.1 | 40.0 | 23.9 | 18.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 25.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 16.4 | 19.2 |
| Moderately Negative | 12.5 | 2.2 | 20.0 | 4.5 | 15.7 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | 4.5 | 2.9 |
| No Response | 30.0 | 73.3 | 20.0 | 46.3 | 37.2 |

### Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.5 | 8.9 | | 3.0 | 6.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 37.5 | 28.9 | 40.0 | 34.3 | 30.2 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 27.5 | 44.4 | 40.0 | 41.8 | 41.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 10.0 | 8.9 | 20.0 | 7.5 | 12.2 |
| Greatly Negative | 2.5 | | | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| No Response | | 8.9 | | 11.9 | 8.7 |

## Socio-economic Values

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 17.5 | 6.7 |  | 9.0 | 7.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.5 | 24.4 | 40.0 | 35.8 | 28.5 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 12.5 | 15.6 |  | 19.4 | 19.8 |
| Moderately Negative | 27.5 | 33.3 | 60.0 | 19.4 | 29.1 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 6.7 |  | 7.5 | 7.6 |
| No Response | 5.0 | 13.3 |  | 9.0 | 7.6 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 5.0 | 6.7 |  | 9.0 | 8.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 35.0 | 15.6 | 20.0 | 20.9 | 20.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 17.5 | 8.9 | 40.0 | 29.9 | 20.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 25.0 | 37.8 | 40.0 | 26.9 | 34.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 10.0 | 20.0 |  | 1.5 | 7.6 |
| No Response | 7.5 | 11.1 |  | 11.9 | 8.7 |

Outside socio-economic and political factors do they compare in importance with the cultural and language features of the trainees?

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Most important in a positive manner | 17.5 | 15.6 |  | 10.4 | 12.8 |
| Most important in a negative manner | 7.5 | 20.0 |  | 7.5 | 9.9 |
| Equal in importance | 27.5 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 38.8 | 38.4 |
| Less important in a negative manner | 27.5 | 17.8 | 20.0 | 17.9 | 18.6 |
| Less important in a positive manner | 7.5 | 2.2 | 40.0 | 19.4 | 7.0 |
| No Response | 12.5 | 11.1 |  |  | 13.4 |

# RESPONSE BY JOB CLASSIFICATION

| Population Group | Administrators | Counselors | Curriculum Specialists | Others | Occupational Specialists |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 5 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 23 |
| Spanish Speaking | 15 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 16 |
| American Indian | 4 | 1 | | | |
| Others | 29 | 19 | 20 | 6 | 98 |
| No Response | | | 1 | | 140 |
| Total | 54 | 39 | 26 | 9 | |

Total Program Personnel Sample

## CULTURAL FEATURES

### Extended Family

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 46.3 | 53.7 |
| Counselors | 59.0 | 41.0 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 69.2 | 30.8 |
| Others | 77.8 | 22.2 |
| Occupational Instructors | 42.9 | 57.1 |

### Close Family Ties-Family Interdependence

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 64.8 | 35.2 |
| Counselors | 61.5 | 38.5 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Others | 44.4 | 55.6 |
| Occupational Instructors | 51.4 | 48.6 |

Family Rather than Individually Oriented Achievement

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 20.4 | 79.6 |
| Counselors | 20.5 | 79.5 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 11.5 | 88.5 |
| Others | 22.2 | 77.8 |
| Occupational Instructors | 25.7 | 74.3 |

Father Head of Family

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Counselors | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 26.9 | 73.1 |
| Others | 22.2 | 77.8 |
| Occupational Instructors | 33.6 | 66.4 |

Male Dominance (authoritarian figure)

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 37.0 | 63.0 |
| Counselors | 28.2 | 71.8 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 30.8 | 69.2 |
| Others | 55.6 | 44.4 |
| Occupational Instructors | 35.0 | 65.0 |

## Mother-Center of Spiritual and Affective Cohesiveness of Family

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 59.3 | 40.7 |
| Counselors | 61.5 | 38.5 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 76.9 | 23.1 |
| Others | 77.8 | 22.2 |
| Occupational Instructors | 53.6 | 46.4 |

## Female Subservience

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 27.8 | 72.2 |
| Counselors | 25.6 | 74.4 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 26.9 | 73.1 |
| Others | 22.2 | 77.8 |
| Occupational Instructors | 25.0 | 75.0 |

## Style of Residence (ghetto, barrio, tribal or rural)

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 61.1 | 38.9 |
| Counselors | 69.2 | 30.8 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 65.4 | 34.6 |
| Others | 77.8 | 22.2 |
| Occupational Instru[illegible] | 67.1 | 32.9 |

## Community or Ethnic Group Oriented Achievement

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 25.9 | 74.1 |
| Counselors | 23.1 | 76.9 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 11.5 | 88.5 |
| Others | 44.4 | 55.6 |
| Occupational Instructors | 22.9 | 77.1 |

## More Co-operatively Oriented than Competitively Oriented

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 48.1 | 51.9 |
| Counselors | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 26.9 | 73.1 |
| Others | 44.4 | 55.6 |
| Occupational Instructors | 38.6 | 61.4 |

## Monolingual Speaker of a Dialect

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 27.8 | 72.2 |
| Counselors | 20.5 | 79.5 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 34.6 | 65.4 |
| Others | 22.2 | 77.8 |
| Occupational Instructors | 34.3 | 65.7 |

## Bilingual

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 42.6 | 57.4 |
| Counselors | 41.0 | 59.0 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 42.3 | 57.7 |
| Others | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| Occupational Instructors | 33.6 | 66.4 |

## Free of Anxiety in their Attitude Toward Time

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 44.4 | 55.6 |
| Counselors | 30.8 | 69.2 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 34.6 | 65.4 |
| Others | 55.6 | 44.4 |
| Occupational Instructors | 37.1 | 62.9 |

## Undependable in Time Structured Situations

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 40.7 | 59.3 |
| Counselors | 35.9 | 64.1 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 38.5 | 61.5 |
| Others | 55.6 | 44.4 |
| Occupational Instructors | 34.3 | 65.7 |

## Strong Religious Feelings and Affiliations

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 42.6 | 57.4 |
| Counselors | 48.7 | 51.3 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 34.6 | 65.4 |
| Others | 11.1 | 88.9 |
| Occupational Instructors | 35.7 | 64.3 |

## Superstitious in their Beliefs

| Program Personnel Responses To: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 18.5 | 81.5 |
| Counselors | 35.9 | 64.1 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 19.2 | 80.8 |
| Others | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Occupational Instructors | 25.7 | 74.3 |

## THE EFFECT OF FAMILY STRUCTURES AND VALUES

### Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Discourages | 3.7 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 22.2 | 2.1 |
| Moderately Discourages | 16.7 | 17.9 | 23.1 | 44.4 | 27.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 10.3 | 7.7 |  | 12.1 |
| Moderately Encourages | 48.1 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 11.1 | 47.9 |
| Greatly Encourages | 11.1 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 8.6 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 10.3 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 2.1 |

### Occupational Preference

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 12.8 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 16.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 53.7 | 38.5 | 57.7 | 22.2 | 45.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 25.9 | 28.2 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 17.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 7.4 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 44.4 | 15.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 1.9 | 2.6 |  |  | 1.4 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 5.1 |  | 11.1 | 2.9 |

## Attendance

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 12.8 | 7.7 | | 10.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 16.7 | 28.2 | 26.9 | 22.2 | 34.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 17.9 | 3.8 | | 12.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 42.6 | 35.9 | 53.8 | 44.4 | 30.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 9.3 | 2.6 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 11.4 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 2.6 | | 11.1 | 1.4 |

## Dropout Rate

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 3.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 16.7 | 25.6 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 25.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 23.1 | 19.2 | | 18.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 44.4 | 28.2 | 42.3 | 33.3 | 40.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 22.2 | 9.3 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 | | 11.1 | 2.9 |

## Orientation to Continuous Employment

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 14.8 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 15.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 33.3 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 55.6 | 45.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 11.1 | 17.9 | 3.8 | | 5.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 33.3 | 23.1 | 42.3 | 11.1 | 26.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 3.7 | 5.1 | | 11.1 | 4.3 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 7.7 | | 11.1 | 4.3 |

## Setting Long and Short-range Goals

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 5.1 | 7.7 | | 10.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 40.7 | 30.8 | 46.2 | 55.6 | 36.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 25.6 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 14.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 22.2 | 23.1 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 25.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 9.3 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 7.9 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 2.6 | | 11.1 | 5.0 |

## Commitment to Task Completion

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 5.6 | 5.1 | 11.5 | | 9.3 |
| Moderately Positive | 37.0 | 38.5 | 50.0 | 22.2 | 40.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 23.1 | 19.2 | 33.3 | 19.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 29.6 | 23.1 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 22.1 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.6 | 2.6 | | 11.1 | 5.0 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 7.7 | | 22.2 | 4.3 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 12.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 37.0 | 28.2 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 22.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 20.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 14.8 | 15.4 | 38.5 | 22.2 | 14.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 9.3 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 2.9 |
| No Response | 11.1 | 20.5 | 11.5 | 33.3 | 28.6 |

## Relationship with Counselors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 3.7 | 20.5 | 15.4 | | 12.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.8 | 33.3 | 26.9 | 22.2 | 15.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 12.8 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 8.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 11.1 | 7.7 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 5.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 1.9 | | | | 1.4 |
| No Response | 40.7 | 25.6 | 26.9 | 44.4 | 56.4 |

## Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 20.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.9 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 22.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 15.4 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 13.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 9.3 | 5.1 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 4.3 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | | 2.1 |
| No Response | 38.9 | 41.0 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 36.4 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 18.5 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 25.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 46.3 | 46.2 | 50.0 | 33.3 | 38.6 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 25.9 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 18.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 5.6 | 10.3 | 3.8 | 33.3 | 12.1 |
| Greatly Negative | | | | | 2.1 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 5.1 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 2.9 |

## Socio-economic Values

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 17.4 | 17.9 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 11.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 44.4 | 33.3 | 46.2 | 55.6 | 36.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.4 | 7.7 | 7.7 |  | 8.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 25.9 | 30.8 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 31.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 7.7 |  |  | 6.4 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 2.6 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 5.7 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 14.8 | 25.6 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 15.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 35.2 | 23.1 | 30.8 | 55.6 | 35.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 11.1 | 15.4 | 7.7 |  | 8.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 31.5 | 28.2 | 42.3 | 22.2 | 31.4 |
| Greatly Negative |  | 5.1 | 3.8 |  | 5.0 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 4.3 |

## THE EFFECT OF THE STYLE OF RESIDENCE AND LIFE

### Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Discourages | 13.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 8.6 |
| Moderately Discourages | 40.7 | 38.5 | 50.0 | 44.4 | 37.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 5.1 | 3.8 |  | 12.1 |
| Moderately Encourages | 22.2 | 35.9 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 31.4 |
| Greatly Encourages | 5.6 | 7.7 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 5.0 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 5.0 |

### Occupational Preference

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 17.9 | 15.4 |  | 17.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.8 | 28.2 | 30.8 | 22.2 | 35.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 12.8 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 17.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 37.0 | 28.2 | 30.8 | 33.3 | 17.1 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.6 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 5.0 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 |  | 11.1 | 7.1 |

## Attendance

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 7.7 | | | 7.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 11.1 | 17.9 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 30.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 9.3 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 10.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 48.1 | 38.5 | 53.8 | 33.3 | 40.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 18.5 | 20.5 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 7.9 |
| No Response | 3.7 | | | 11.1 | 4.3 |

## Dropout Rate

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 5.6 | 12.8 | | | 6.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 13.0 | 7.7 | 15.4 | | 15.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 20.5 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 20.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 48.1 | 35.9 | 61.5 | 44.4 | 36.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 13.0 | 17.9 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 12.9 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 | | 11.1 | 8.6 |

## Orientation to Continuous Employment

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 3.7 | 7.7 | | | 12.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.9 | 23.1 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 27.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 11.1 | 20.5 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 12.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 42.6 | 33.3 | 53.8 | 44.4 | 35.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 11.1 | 12.8 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 5.7 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 2.6 | | 11.1 | 6.4 |

## Setting of Long and Short-range Goals

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 5.1 | 7.7 | | 8.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 18.5 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 30.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 20.4 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 14.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.2 | 41.0 | 57.7 | 22.2 | 29.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 9.3 | 10.3 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 12.1 |
| No Response | 9.3 | 5.1 | | 11.1 | 5.7 |

## Commitment to Task Completion

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 12.8 | | | 10.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.9 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 33.6 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 33.3 | 15.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 38.9 | 43.6 | 53.8 | 44.4 | 30.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 3.7 | 5.1 | 11.5 | | 4.3 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 10.3 | | 11.1 | 5.7 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 11.1 | 10.3 | 15.4 | | 6.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.9 | 12.8 | 11.5 | | 21.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 11.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 24.1 | 17.9 | 26.9 | 22.2 | 26.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.6 | 7.7 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 5.0 |
| No Response | 14.8 | 28.2 | 15.4 | 55.6 | 29.3 |

## Relationship with Counselor

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 17.9 | 11.5 |  | 7.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.2 | 30.8 | 15.4 |  | 18.6 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.4 | 10.3 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 4.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 14.8 | 20.5 | 15.4 | 44.4 | 10.7 |
| Greatly Negative |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |
| No Response | 48.1 | 20.5 | 30.8 | 44.4 | 59.3 |

## Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 14.3 |
| Moderately Positive | 24.1 | 17.9 | 23.1 | 22.2 | 23.6 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 13.0 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 10.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 11.1 | 20.5 | 15.4 |  | 10.0 |
| Greatly Negative |  | 2.6 | 3.8 | 33.3 | .7 |
| No Response | 44.4 | 38.5 | 30.8 | 22.2 | 40.7 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 22.2 | 25.6 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 27.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 38.9 | 43.6 | 30.8 | 22.2 | 36.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 17.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 16.7 | 12.8 | 26.9 | 33.3 | 11.4 |
| Greatly Negative |  | 2.6 | 3.8 |  | 1.4 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 |  | 22.2 | 5.7 |

## Socio-economic Values

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 5.6 | 15.4 | 11.5 | | 10.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 31.5 | 23.1 | 34.6 | 11.1 | 29.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.4 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 10.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 37.0 | 35.9 | 34.6 | 55.6 | 30.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 12.8 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 9.3 |
| No Response | 11.1 | 2.6 | | 11.1 | 10.7 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 13.0 | 23.1 | 11.5 | | 11.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 18.5 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 27.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 11.1 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 12.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 40.7 | 35.9 | 42.3 | 44.4 | 35.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 6.4 |
| No Response | 9.3 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 6.4 |

# LANGUAGE

## Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 20.4 | 20.5 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 15.0 |
| Moderate | 44.4 | 41.0 | 50.0 | 44.4 | 42.1 |
| None | 29.6 | 33.3 | 26.9 | 11.1 | 38.6 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 22.2 | 4.3 |

## Preference of Skill Areas

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 25.9 | 28.2 | 30.8 | 22.2 | 20.7 |
| Moderate | 40.7 | 41.0 | 57.7 | 44.4 | 50.7 |
| None | 27.8 | 28.2 | 11.5 | 22.2 | 23.6 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 2.6 |  | 11.1 | 5.0 |

## Rate of Progress

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 25.9 | 25.6 | 34.6 | 11.1 | 33.6 |
| Moderate | 50.0 | 59.0 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 47.9 |
| None | 18.5 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 15.7 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 |  | 22.2 | 2.9 |

## Vocational Proficiency upon Completion of Program

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 20.4 | 28.2 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 27.1 |
| Moderate | 55.6 | 51.3 | 53.8 | 44.4 | 48.6 |
| None | 18.5 | 17.9 | 26.9 |  | 19.3 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 2.6 |  | 33.3 | 5.0 |

## Relationship with Program Personnel

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 9.3 | 17.9 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 12.1 |
| Moderate | 53.7 | 46.2 | 34.6 | 44.4 | 45.7 |
| None | 31.5 | 35.9 | 53.8 | 33.3 | 37.9 |
| No Response | 5.6 |  |  | 11.1 | 4.3 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 7.4 | 10.3 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 11.4 |
| Moderate | 29.6 | 38.5 | 34.6 | 22.2 | 31.4 |
| None | 55.6 | 48.7 | 57.7 | 55.6 | 53.6 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 2.6 |  | 11.1 | 3.6 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Great | 13.0 | 23.1 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 25.0 |
| Moderate | 53.7 | 48.7 | 61.5 | 44.4 | 47.1 |
| None | 27.8 | 25.6 | 30.8 | 22.2 | 23.6 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 2.6 |  | 11.1 | 4.3 |

## THE EFFECT OF DIALECT OR NATIVE LANGUAGE

### Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 11.1 | 25.6 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 15.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 40.7 | 33.3 | 38.5 | 33.3 | 14.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 9.3 | 25.6 | 26.9 | 11.1 | 21.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 13.0 | 2.6 | 11.5 |  | 5.0 |
| Greatly Negative | 3.7 |  |  | 11.1 | 4.3 |
| No Response | 22.2 | 12.8 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 39.3 |

### Preference of Skill Areas

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 30.8 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 12.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 33.3 | 25.6 | 34.6 | 33.3 | 19.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 20.4 | 23.1 | 34.6 | 11.1 | 22.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 11.1 | 2.6 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 4.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 3.7 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 1.4 |
| No Response | 22.2 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 40.7 |

### Rate of Progress

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 16.7 | 28.2 | 7.7 | | 15.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 29.6 | 25.9 | 61.5 | 44.4 | 17.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 12.8 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 15.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 13.0 | 7.7 | 15.4 | | 7.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 3.7 | | | 22.2 | 2.9 |
| No Response | 27.2 | 15.4 | 11.5 | 22.2 | 40.7 |

### Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 13.0 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 13.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 18.5 | 12.8 | 26.9 | 33.3 | 7.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.4 | 15.4 | 34.6 | 11.1 | 14.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 9.3 | 5.1 | | | 4.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 1.9 | 2.6 | | | |
| No Response | 50.0 | 48.7 | 23.1 | 44.4 | 60.0 |

### Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 13.0 | 23.1 | | | 13.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 29.6 | 41.0 | 42.3 | 22.2 | 15.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 24.1 | 20.5 | 34.6 | 33.3 | 27.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 11.1 | 2.6 | 11.5 | | 2.9 |
| Greatly Negative | | | 3.8 | | .7 |
| No Response | 22.2 | 12.8 | 7.7 | 44.4 | 40.0 |

Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 14.8 | 30.8 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 15.7 |
| Moderately Positive | 27.8 | 33.3 | 61.5 | 22.2 | 19.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 16.7 | 5.1 |  | 22.2 | 16.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 18.5 | 12.8 | 23.1 |  | 7.1 |
| Greatly Negative |  | 2.6 |  |  |  |
| No Response | 22.2 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 44.4 | 41.4 |

Should trainees be taught occupational skills in his dialect and taught English/as a separate skill/necessary to function in a job situation?

| Program Personnel | 0 | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 24.1 | 20.4 | 55.6 |
| Counselors | 12.8 | 23.1 | 64.1 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 7.7 | 19.2 | 73.1 |
| Others | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| Occupational Instructors | 40.0 | 19.3 | 40.7 |

Do trainees show preference for manual skills?

| Program Personnel | 0 | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Administrators | 14.8 | 63.0 | 22.2 |
| Counselors | 7.7 | 64.1 | 28.2 |
| Curriculum Specialists | 15.4 | 53.8 | 30.8 |
| Others | 11.1 | 55.6 | 33.3 |
| Occupational Instructors | 5.0 | 71.4 | 23.6 |

Preference to the Cultural and Language of the Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Large Degree | 35.2 | 46.2 | 30.8 | 44.4 | 44.3 |
| Minor Degree | 31.5 | 20.5 | 34.6 | 22.2 | 31.4 |
| No Degree at All | 14.8 | 17.9 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 17.9 |
| No Response | 18.5 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 6.4 |

Do religious beliefs and affiliations play a significant role in their participation in the training process?

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Large Degree | 24.1 | 35.9 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 23.6 |
| Minor Degree | 11.1 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 17.1 |
| No Degree at All | 61.1 | 53.8 | 76.9 | 66.7 | 53.6 |
| No Response | 3.7 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 5.7 |

# THE EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS

## Willingness to Enroll

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Discourages | 14.8 | 23.1 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 10.7 |
| Moderately Discourages | 33.3 | 38.5 | 23.1 | 44.4 | 36.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.2 | 12.8 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 25.0 |
| Moderately Encourages | 20.4 | 15.4 | 34.6 | 11.1 | 17.9 |
| Greatly Encourages | 3.7 |  | 7.7 |  | 6.4 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 10.3 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 3.6 |

## Occupational Preference

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 11.1 | 12.8 | 7.7 |  | 7.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 29.6 | 28.2 | 34.6 | 11.1 | 24.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 12.8 | 30.8 | 22.2 | 28.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 29.6 | 30.8 | 15.4 | 33.3 | 28.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.6 | 5.1 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 7.1 |
| No Response | 9.3 | 10.3 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 4.3 |

## Attendance

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 3.7 | 7.7 | | | 6.4 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.2 | 25.6 | 15.4 | | 22.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 30.8 | 26.9 | 33.3 | 29.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.2 | 25.6 | 38.5 | 44.4 | 33.6 |
| Greatly Negative | 14.8 | 2.6 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 5.0 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 3.6 |

## Dropout Rate

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 1.9 | 5.1 | | | 4.3 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.9 | 15.4 | 30.8 | 11.1 | 16.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 30.8 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 27.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.2 | 33.3 | 34.6 | 22.2 | 37.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 11.1 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 33.3 | 7.9 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 5.7 |

## Orientation to Continuous Employment

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 1.9 | 10.3 | 7.7 | | 10.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 25.9 | 20.5 | 26.9 | 11.1 | 25.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 18.5 | 17.9 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 24.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.2 | 38.5 | 34.6 | 44.4 | 27.1 |
| Greatly Negative | 11.1 | 5.1 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 7.1 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 6.4 |

## Setting of Long and Short-range Goals

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 12.8 | | | 5.0 |
| Moderately Positive | 29.6 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 22.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 13.0 | 23.1 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 27.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.2 | 23.1 | 38.5 | 22.2 | 26.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 5.6 | 12.8 | 15.4 | 33.3 | 11.4 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 7.1 |

## Commitment to Task Completion

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 1.9 | 7.7 | 3.8 | | 8.6 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.2 | 20.5 | 26.9 | 11.1 | 22.1 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 31.5 | 20.5 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 25.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 29.6 | 38.5 | 26.9 | 44.4 | 29.3 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 2.5 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 5.7 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 8.6 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 13.0 | 12.8 | | | 7.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 18.5 | 12.8 | 11.5 | | 14.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 25.9 | 23.1 | 38.5 | 22.2 | 25.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 24.1 | 17.9 | 26.9 | 22.2 | 22.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 3.7 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 22.2 | 2.9 |
| No Response | 14.8 | 30.8 | 19.2 | 33.3 | 27.1 |

## Relationship with Counselor

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 12.8 | | | 4.3 |
| Moderately Positive | 18.5 | 17.9 | 23.1 | | 15.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 13.0 | 20.5 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 12.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 16.7 | 10.3 | 19.2 | 33.3 | 11.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 1.9 | | | | 1.4 |
| No Response | 40.7 | 38.5 | 34.6 | 55.6 | 55.0 |

## Vocational Proficiency upon Completion of Program

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 7.4 | 28.2 | 3.8 | | 12.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 35.2 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 44.4 | 20.0 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 13.0 | 10.3 | 26.9 | 11.1 | 14.3 |
| Moderately Negative | 13.0 | 5.1 | 23.1 | | 7.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 2.6 | | 22.2 | 3.6 |
| No Response | 24.1 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 41.4 |

## Relationship with Administrators

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 13.0 | 20.5 | 19.2 | | 12.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 31.5 | 20.5 | 15.4 | 33.3 | 13.6 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 11.1 | 15.4 | 30.8 | 11.1 | 17.9 |
| Moderately Negative | 13.0 | 7.7 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 5.7 |
| Greatly Negative | 1.9 | 2.6 | | 11.1 | .7 |
| No Response | 29.6 | 33.3 | 23.1 | 33.3 | 50.0 |

## Relationship with Counselors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 14.8 | 20.5 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 9.3 |
| Moderately Positive | 14.8 | 23.1 | 19.2 | 11.1 | 11.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.4 | 15.4 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 10.7 |
| Moderately Negative | 9.3 | 2.6 |  | 11.1 | 3.6 |
| Greatly Negative |  |  |  |  | .7 |
| No Response | 53.7 | 38.5 | 38.5 | 55.6 | 64.3 |

## Self-image

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 7.7 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 22.2 | 20.5 | 30.8 |  | 22.9 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 14.8 | 10.3 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 23.6 |
| Moderately Negative | 35.2 | 35.9 | 42.3 | 22.2 | 31.4 |
| Greatly Negative | 11.1 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 33.3 | 7.1 |
| No Response | 7.4 | 12.8 | 7.7 | 22.2 | 7.1 |

Outside socio-economic and political factors do they compare in importance with the cultural and language features of the trainees?

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Most important in a positive manner | 14.8 | 12.8 | 7.7 |  | 16.4 |
| Most important in a negative manner | 14.8 | 17.9 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 7.1 |
| Equal in importance | 29.6 | 30.8 | 38.5 | 44.4 | 39.3 |
| Less important in a negative manner | 16.7 | 12.8 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 22.1 |
| Less important in a positive manner | 7.4 | 10.3 | 11.5 |  | 5.0 |
| No Response | 16.7 | 15.4 | 11.5 | 22.2 | 10.0 |

## Relationship with Instructors

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 5.6 | 7.7 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 7.1 |
| Moderately Positive | 20.4 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 11.1 | 19.3 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 22.2 | 17.9 | 30.8 | 11.1 | 16.4 |
| Moderately Negative | 13.0 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 12.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 1.9 | | | 11.1 | 2.1 |
| No Response | 37.0 | 53.8 | 34.6 | 33.3 | 42.1 |

## Relationship with Fellow Trainees

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 17.9 | 7.7 | | 7.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 33.3 | 30.8 | 34.6 | 22.2 | 30.7 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 38.9 | 35.9 | 38.5 | 66.7 | 40.0 |
| Moderately Negative | 13.0 | 10.3 | 11.5 | | 11.4 |
| Greatly Negative | | | 3.8 | | 1.4 |
| No Response | 5.6 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 8.6 |

## Socio-economic Values

| Degree of Effect | Black | Spanish Speaking | American Indian | Appalachian White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Greatly Positive | 9.3 | 15.4 | 3.8 | | 7.9 |
| Moderately Positive | 31.5 | 25.6 | 38.5 | 22.2 | 26.4 |
| Neutral (no influence) | 7.4 | 20.5 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 22.1 |
| Moderately Negative | 33.3 | 28.2 | 34.6 | 44.4 | 27.9 |
| Greatly Negative | 7.4 | 5.1 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 7.9 |
| No Response | 11.1 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.1 | 7.9 |

# APPENDIX C

# SYMPOSIUM: PERSPECTIVES ON BLACK MANPOWER VOCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT -- CULTURAL PARAMETERS

# "Perspectives on Black Manpower Vocational Development: Cultural Parameters"

## FOREWORD

A study of the effect of cultural and linguistic variables (CLV) on the occupational aspirations and performance of blacks in manpower and vocational training is incomplete unless it contains input from representative members of that population group. With the cooperation of the Afro-American Studies Department at Howard University, Washington, D.C., as host, the CLV Project of Olympus Research Corporation sponsored a symposium. This symposium titled "Perspectives on Black Manpower Vocational Development: Cultural Parameters" was held in Founders Library at Howard University on March 8, 1972.

The panelists, all black, are involved in diverse academic and professional endeavors related to improvement of the education, health, and welfare of the black community. Involvement in black concerns through the years has enhanced their capacity to represent the community and provide candid perceptions for consideration by the CLV project. Attached are the panelists' prepared statements which reflect essentially the basis of their discussions during the symposium.

A-135

# "Perspectives on Black Manpower Vocational Development: Cultural Parameters"

SYMPOSIUM

Howard University
Afro-American Studies Department
Founders Library
Washington, D.C.

1 P.M.
March 8, 1972

Sponsored by:

Olympus Research Corporation
Cultural and Linguistic Variables Project
818 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

# MUTABILITY OF PERCEPTION OF VOCATIONAL LEGITIMACY

## Basic Position

Unless manpower training programs effectively nullify cross- and counterproductive models of reward structures and institutions, those programs are doomed to have insurmountable motivation problems.

Manpower training programs must become functionally and realistically affirmative in a wider economic-technological context that is, and has been, historically and politically negative.

A cross-productive system here defined is one whose rewards stem from decisions and values contrary to those of manpower training programs, i.e., criminal behavior, nonwork dependency income situations, white counterculture, and superculture patterns. A counterproductive system here defined is one which contradicts the implicit claims of most manpower training programs, i.e., a poverty area where there are simply no jobs available.

The very visible models of the white counterculture must be understood and explained to the satisfaction of young blacks involved in training programs: How to justify the rejection of the work ethic by members of the dominant culture while simultaneously promoting it among the black minority. White superculture means those individuals at the "top" of the income distribution ladders whose rewards are grossly disproportionate to any exertion on their part, a superculture celebrated in the media. In short, how to explain a seniority of prerogatives and promote a prerogative of competence rather than class.

II

Manpower training programs must build into their socialization curricula a socio-historical dimension showing the changing concepts of the economically permissible, probable, and possible over time.

While the psychodynamics of racism probably have remained the same, there has been a vast fluctuation in the judgments of the dominant group about the economically permissible and the competence of black workers. Concomitantly there has been a fluctuation of the degrees of optimism within black America over the rational utility of certain lines of exertion for economic support.

By broadening the contextual basis of social judgment for manpower trainees, it might be possible greatly to accelerate the process of self-revaluation so necessary for high motivation and participation in the program.

## Major Argument

The major argument of this participant is that black workers live in an apartheid ecology and economy that fundamentally contradicts the very foundation of a manpower training program, and that unless concentrated attention is given to the exceptions to that contradiction, the impact of a manpower development and training program will be minimal.

The theory of manpower programs, development as well as training, is that it is possible through training to contribute to the economic and social well-being of the individual, the economy and the nation. Structural changes in the job market and in the spatial distribution of the races complicate this assumption. In reality black potential workers and subemployed workers are operating under the inertia of an earlier purely exploitive system which defined the welfare of the nation as the welfare of whites primarily, while attitudes toward blacks, in an economic sense, shifted from a pole of seeing them as economic nuisances or at best necessary evils to seeing them as economic assets and necessities.

Since the Second World War, the accelerating mechanization of work has drastically changed the structure of employment and subtly degraded "work"; the shortened work week and the demand for increased psychological benefits reflect these changes. A manpower training program has to explain its relevance in the face of this reality.

Recommendation

1. Develop a carefully constructed elementary curriculum on macro- or structural economics, candidly showing the trends and contradictions.
2. Develop aggressive and yet unobtrusive placement policies for trainees.
3. Demonstrate in curricula the negative probability of the average trainee succeeding in finding himself in a counterculture or anti-social "success" situation through a sound exposition of the sociology of "hustling."
4. Promote in-service training of agency staff, black and white, to understand more profoundly the contextual continuities and alterations of views of economic success and inclusion by blacks over time.
5. Plan for conversion of crisis failure image of manpower training programs into a more positive, supportive image.

Dr. Russell L. Adams, Chairman
Afro-American Studies Department
Howard University
Washington, D.C.
(Political Science/Sociology)
Symposium Moderator

# BLACKS AND THE MANPOWER PROGRAMS: LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

## I. Basic Position

(A) During the 1960s the United States Congress enacted several major public laws which purported to eliminate problems which complicate life for blacks in this country. These laws were enacted partly out of conscience and partly to follow the directives of the Preamble to the United States Constitution.

(B) Blacks, as private citizens, should become more knowledgeable of these laws and monitor more closely federal programs, particularly those enacted specifically in their interests.

## II. Major Points

(A) The Preamble to the U.S. Constitution clearly states that the Constitution, and the legislature created by it, is established to (1) form a more perfect union, (2) ensure domestic tranquility, (3) provide for the common defense, and (4) promote the general welfare. Until the 1960s Congress had failed in this charge.

(B) Each federal department or agency has the overall responsibility to enforce compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in programs which it funds. The compliance effort in some instances is inadequate to monitor all federal programs throughout the country.

## III. Recommendations

(A) Blacks should become more knowledgeable and more vocal (constructively) about those enactments which purport to eliminate black problems. Blacks should more seriously get involved in public hearings in order that they would be in a position to insist upon those laws which they believe they need, rather than only those which others (whites) believe they need.

(B) Blacks should constantly monitor federal programs which were created to make black life better. Monitoring should take two forms: First, to see whether in fact the program, operating under a specific statute, is doing what it was enacted to do. Secondly, to see to it that the program is operated in compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Remarks

The Preamble to the U.S. Constitution states that the Constitution, and the legislature created by it, is established to form a more perfect union, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, and to promote the general welfare. Apparently, earlier Congressmen did not feel that the success of this nation turned upon the enactment of legislation which would guarantee equitable benefits to all citizens. For several years there was no special effort to enact laws which would create programs to eliminate problems which complicate life for blacks. If anything, the contrary was true, for no other reason than the fact that statutes are enacted to promote the general welfare of the majority, and the majority in this country are white. During this period blacks received tangential benefits from legislation as an incident of citizenship in this country. We expect that Congressmen of today will say that past and present legislation is for the benefit of all. We know, however, that many of the laws enacted did not directly affect blacks because they were not in the position to be affected. For example, the antitrust and banking laws were enacted to prevent corruption in big business and high finances. Until recently many blacks collectively did not approximate the amount of monies to which these kinds of laws apply.

To be realistic, legislation with major consideration for blacks was not enacted until the 1960s. If we take a look at the 1960s we find that there were approximately 150 major civil disorders. These disorders were brought about by the gaps in benefits between the black and white citizens of this country. Blacks were unemployed or underemployed; lacked adequate food, housing, education, and health facilities; could not, in some instances vote, use public accommodations; and were generally discriminated against because of their race. There were many things blacks could not do, but they could see. What they saw was the gross inequities between the races. Thus in the 1960s blacks rebelled. There were sit-ins, walk-ins, ride-ins, speeches, boycotts, looting, fires, and all-out destruction of life, limb, and property. Attention was focused on the black predicament as firemen came to put out fires and found no fire hydrants in positions to be useful. Policemen were injured, but there were either inadequate or no hospital or health facilities in the black neighborhoods. Many died before medical attention could be properly given. Army troops were sent in only to find streets which lacked adequate lighting. Looters were chased into buildings where stairs were unsafe, or into a dark maze of hallways where familiarity was the only key to return to the outside world.

There was no domestic tranquility, and it was becoming increasingly apparent that the general welfare had been so narrow that it excluded, to a large extent, black basic needs. Thus out of conscience, Congress acted to perfect the language of the Preamble; to restore domestic tranquility, and promote the equitable welfare of the nation's citizens, to eliminate by legislation those ills which caused the riots.

The 1960s left us the Model Cities Programs under the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (later referred to as the Model Cities

Act because "demonstration cities" was distasteful in light of the recent racial demonstrations); the Economic Opportunities Act, Urban Renewal extensions, Rat Control, Food Stamps, Child Care and Nutrition, Health Services, Birth Control, Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Manpower Development and Training Act to name a few. The struggle for equitable benefits does not stop with legislation which purports to provide services.

Blacks and all minorities of the 1970s should see to it that the legislative legacies of the 1960s are administered in accordance with the true purpose for which they were enacted. Blacks should become more constructively involved in public hearings on proposed programs which are to be established for their benefit in order that they would be in a position to insist upon programs, projects, laws, and regulations that they believe they need rather than those which other (whites) believe they need. Minorities should become both recipients and monitors of programs which receive federal financial assistance. Programs, such as the Manpower Development Program, should be monitored for programmatic and civil rights compliance.

Attempts to monitor programs serve no purpose if those involved are not knowledgeable of the various requirements. Both programmatic and civil rights requirements should be explained to all recipients in order that they might know whether they are actually benefiting from the program as it was established. Quite often brochures and publications concerning programs funded by the federal government go unread because no one asks to be supplied with information. Private citizens tend to leave compliance with federal laws, regulations, and programs up to the government.

This is one mistake the minorities of the 1970s cannot afford. Certainly each federal department has the responsibility to see that programs, regulations, and laws which come within its jurisdiction are administered properly. However, many federal departments and agencies do not have the staff available to monitor all federal programs. Moreover, those with staff often find that their staffs are not educationally or psychologically attuned to minority problems; therefore, their concerns about the proper administration of minority oriented programs are superficial. For example, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in any federally financed program. Each federal department is charged with the responsibility to see to it that programs which they fund are operated in compliance with the Civil Rights Act. Unfortunately, not all federal departments have the staff to investigate and enforce the Civil Rights Act. These departments rely to a large extent on citizen's complaints and zero in on these cases. If there are no citizen complaints about discrimination based on race, color, or national origin, it may well be that discrimination, if it does exist, will continue to the unfortunate detriment of the minority community.

It is my recommendation that those persons to be involved in the Manpower Development Program have available the facilities to exercise their right to KNOW the programmatic and civil rights requirements under the Manpower Development and Training Act. In short, all minorities, particularly blacks, should exercise their right to:

(1) Be knowledgeable about proposed and existing federal programs
(2) Participate or request public hearing on these programs
(3) Be advised by the operating agency of the steps taken to assure compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act
(4) Make formal complaints to the federal department funding the program if there appear to be violations in either the programmatic or civil rights requirements for such a program
(5) Take legal action, either with the assistance of the United States Justice Department, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, or independently,

for the correction of violations in program or civil rights requirements

Mildred Sharpe Morse, Attorney
Office for Civil Rights
U.S. Department of Health, Education
and Welfare (Legislation)
Washington, D.C.

# THE MYTH OF BLACK ENGLISH

1. Almost all of the studies of "black English" are based on so-called deviations from standard English (American).
2. There is as yet no definition or description of "standard English," and linguists engaged in urban language studies, research on the speech of Afro-Americans, etc., have indicated that such definition or description is impossible.
3. Many of the studies of black English are based on the assumption that there are structural similarities between this form of American English and west African languages, although no such structural similarities can be clearly defined.
4. Many of the descriptions of black English deal with problems of phonology, morphology, and syntax, neglecting the fact that features cited as characteristic of black English are found in the speech of persons classified as white.
5. Studies of black English overlook the fact that there are within the black community class distinctions based on socioeconomic factors which are reflected in speech.
6. Emphasis is placed on the development of bidialectualism, a skill parallel with bilingualism, although it is generally acknowledged that the number of people who can be classified as bilingual in the real sense of the word is very small.
7. If language is considered a vehicle for communication, and an essential part of the communication process is identification of speaker and hearer to establish a set of values that will affect the readiness of the audience to receive the message, much of the unique quality of black English, if

there is such a thing, will be found in those patterns concerned with self-identification and values, i.e., in the semantic structure rather than in the phonology, morphology, or syntax.

Dr. Joseph R. Applegate, Professor
African Studies
Howard University (Linguistics)
Washington, D.C.

# ADULT EDUCATION AND THE BLACK CITIZEN: PARTICIPANT SELECTION AND CURRICULUM DESIGN

## I. Basic Position

A. Black adult education has been largely neglected by business and industry, schools, and the local, state, and federal government.

B. Adults take courses for one or more of the following reasons:

1. They are goal oriented
2. They are action (or activity) oriented
3. They are learning oriented (some programs are voluntary, some are compulsory)

C. The field of adult education has traditionally not been concerned with a product that is salable, if the students were black.

## II. Major Arguments

A. Adult education among whites has been involved in job training for "upgrading" and maintaining skills, particularly in management.

B. Adult education has been remiss in not endeavoring to broaden the education of black adults.

C. Adult education has traditionally avoided instruction for blacks beyond the basic skills.

## Questions for Reflection

A. Should the primary content of adult education for blacks be based on the humanities, the social sciences, or vocations?

B. Should adult learning for blacks be concerned primarily with the clarification of ideas and intellectual processes or preparing the learner for action in community or society?

C. Should the teacher of black adults have a permissive philosophy or seek to bring about changes in the adult student?

## Recommendations

A. The adult education curriculum should satisfy what the black adult says he wants, in addition to what curriculum specialists say he ought to have.

B. The adult education curriculum for blacks should be selected, organized, and evaluated by a teacher and by those taking part in the educational program.

C. Stress should be placed on the content and subject matter for blacks in adult education and the methods of adult education.

D. Black educational institutions should become increasingly concerned and involved in ensuring that blacks are offered the kinds of education and training, vocational development, and career progression skills in various fields of endeavor.

Dr. Clarence N. Blake, Professor
Department of Adult Education
Graduate School
Federal City College
(Adult and Continuing Education)
Washington, D.C.

# CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC VARIABLES WHICH AFFECT THE OUTCOME OF MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

I. Basic Position

A. That the socioeconomic differences between blacks and whites are self-perpetuating because they run on what might be described as a "closed circuit."

B. That the dominant culture in America is based on sets of assumptions which support "colonial attitudes" toward subcultures.

C. That the worth of a culture varies directly with the amount of power and influence wielded by the guardians of the culture.

D. That most of the people in America, black, white, or "other," are expendable and that blacks cannot reasonably expect to be brought into the "system." The best we can do is to maximize taking advantage of lowered bars to our progress.

E. The two facets to be dealt with involve what society does or does not do for minority people on the one hand, and what the minority groups do or not do for themselves. The gap between opportunity and the perception of opportunity is a major educational problem which the minority groups must solve.

II. Major Argument

A. That the examination of variables must begin with a consideration of what characterizes the prevailing "American" cultural and linguistic patterns.

B. That we need to work toward the attainment of cultural pluralism which I define as a condition which allows persons to deal with the economy in the language of the economy and to deal with their personal, cultural, and social needs in whatever medium works for them.

C. That the work world as the minority person sees it from the outside is full of contradictions. It is a mutual problem to deal with the resolution of the conflicts which occur when the minority worker comes face to face with the contradictions.

D. That industry must seek new consumers for its productive capacity has saturated the current body of consumers beyond its power to absorb any more. We along with the rest of the third world can and must obtain a piece of the productive action rather than remain as consumers who buy what we are told by the advertising media.

## Recommendations

### A. General

1. Leaders must observe and become involved in the new information education business.
2. We must make better adjustments to the "service" economy.
3. We must join the technology revolution.

### B. Specific

1. We must apply new techniques for appraisal of existing skills of trainees in manpower programs.
2. We must apply techniques of teaching standard English as a second language to both foreign born and native born.
3. We must update the job development and placement functions in manpower programs.
4. We must apply and extend the skills of counseling and follow-up.
5. We must apply techniques of task analysis and modular construction of courses.
6. We must include competency-based training within the modular structure.

7. We must make better utilization of the resources of institutes of higher education.

8. We must apply systems approaches, and the systems must be comprehensive.

9. We must develop a better way to utilize the teachers of skills and the counselors as link-up resources between the trainee and the utilizing agencies.

10. We must revamp the whole body of assumptions which influence the employer as well as the employee.

11. The concept of involvement of the persons receiving the training in the planning and development of the programs must be refined.

12. The processes of inclusion and involvement must be developed and implemented at the local level and developed as a local institution to replace the welfare mentality.

13. The community served by the manpower training center must become involved in the political management of the program so they can manipulate the system in ways recognizable to themselves.

Reginald J. Pearman
Doctoral Candidate
University of Massachusetts
Center for Urban Study
Branch Chief
Career Opportunity Program USOE
(Urban Education)
Washington, D.C.

# MANPOWER AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING RELATED TO THE BLACK COMMUNITY

## I. Basic Position

A. Manpower programs have raised hopes of people with training and promises of jobs that never materialize.

B. Old-line standards used by U.S.E.A., integrated into new manpower programs and used along with new ideas, only allow counselors to diagnose problems, but never provide treatment or realistic remedies.

C. Fail-safe guidelines of employers provide limited opportunities for persons who are considered high-risk employees.

D. Job developers and counselors, who are content to offer inadequate wages, as well as below minimum wage employment in order to increase job placement statistics.

## II. Major Arguments

A. Many individuals have hopes of being employed and believe that the new manpower programs would solve their problem: "Find me a job." Some of these individuals are asking to be placed in menial and low-paying positions, they only want a job. Others are looking for better paying jobs of a meaningful nature . . . for all who do not understand what meaningful means to the unemployed, it means more money, better working conditions, sick and annual leave, retirement programs (not just social security), a boss who respects the employees, a credit union, low-cost life insurance, liberal hospitalization policies, and promotions . . . it means a chance to live to retire. Some people need to be made job ready; some need to be made skill ready, and skill ready has nothing to do with washing dishes with both hands while filling in for the short-order cook and bussing dishes in your spare time. In any event they are all saying, "Find me a job."

B. All applicants are placed in categories to be dealt with according to old-line standards by being asked many dehumanizing questions. Would you believe that some employers want a black with unquestionable racial credentials. The job order reads like this: Negro male, non-negroid features, no bush, and no process.

C. Agency guidelines solve placement problems through standardized, rigged procedures. To defeat them, high-risk employees must present evidence of prior experience in the field he desires to work in. Words like "upward mobility" are not in the employment agency's dictionary. These so-called fail-safe guidelines are only directed toward the compilation of placement statistics, not the creation of advantageous employment opportunities for the unemployed. Manpower and vocational services should concentrate upon creating employment within a broader spectrum of the job market. The situation has poor people herded into low-level, underpaying jobs like maintenance, food service, and if they are lucky, general office work. These jobs require almost no training, and responsibilities delegated to workers are negligible.

D. Many job developers and counselors are content to offer the unskilled or nonjob-ready applicant low-paying or menial jobs. They would rather agree with employers who will not consider hiring blacks, welfare recipients, unskilled workers, etc., for anything other than the lowest paying jobs. Counselors, rather than deal with employers to arrive at a solution to the problem, remain status quo in their thinking.

The new manpower programs have done a sloppy job of training low-income persons and have created a haphazard trained group of workers. This situation has caused employers to be reluctant to hire anyone who has been trained in these programs.

## III. Recommendations

A. Creation of programs that deal realistically with present job market.

B. Job developers who can develop jobs according to the needs of the recipients.

C. Training programs that are conventional and accredited, with supportive remedial programs.

D. Communication should be opened between job developers and employers that changes employer's thinking and understanding so his unrealistic guidelines do not hinder or defeat job applicants.

E. Interviewers should be trained to stop searching for the complete human being (ideal employee).

Mrs. Theresa Howe Jones
Assistant Branch Chief
Congress Heights Neighborhood
Development Program
(Community Action Program)
Washington, D.C.

# APPENDIX D

# PANEL DISCUSSION: CHICANO CULTURE AND OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

# CHICANO CULTURE AND OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITY: A PANEL DISCUSSION[1]

by

Mario Barrera, Juan Gomez-Q., Yamil Lara,
Amado M. Padilla, Jaime J. M. Raigoza, and Jaime Seña Rivera

---

[1] Our thanks to Asterio Jano for ideas contributed in the formation of this discussion, arranged under the auspices of Olympic Research Corporation through a contract with the Division of Manpower Development and Training, United States Office of Education (Contract No. OEG-0-71-4777 (335).

Moderator: Jaime Seña Rivera
Assistant Professor
Sociology and Chicano Studies
University of California, Riverside

Panelists: Mario Barrera
Assistant Professor
Political Science
University of California, San Diego

Juan Gomez-Q.
Lecturer
History
University of California, Los Angeles

Yamil Lara
Instructor, Economics and Chicano Studies
Pomona College, The Claremont Colleges
Claremont, California

Amado Padilla
Assistant Professor
Psychology and Chicano Studies
University of California, Santa Barbara

Jaime Raigoza
Assistant Professor
Sociology
San Fernando Valley State College
Northridge, California

# INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS

## Mario Barrera

From my own perspective, that is, from the standpoint of political science and politics, the first point I would like to make is that in taking a look at this topic of Chicano culture and its relationship to occupations, we need to take a look at the political status of Chicanos. If we look at the relationship between culture and occupations from a strictly individual perspective we are missing the most important aspect of the relationship. In other words, what I would like to emphasize from the first is that in the relationship between Chicano culture and occupations the structural relationship as well as the individual one needs to be looked at in great detail. So I would like to address myself to this relationship and to one way of looking at the status of the Chicano community, one way that I find to be a useful way, and that is to conceptualize the status of Chicanos as an internal colony.

The concept of the internal colony has been used in various kinds of publications before. It enters into political debate from time to time, and it has been used as well by some other ethnic groups, particularly blacks in the United States. But the concept has never been defined in a very satisfactory way. I think one way of looking at the concept of Chicanos as an internal colony, and emphasizing the aspect of culture, is also to emphasize that Chicanos are identified as a group by the larger system of which they are a part, the political system. They are identified in terms of their culture and their cultural identification. It isn't only culture that enters into that identification, although culture is very important. I think that basic biological characteristics - that is, race - also enter into the identification of the group, and of the individual within that group. But culture, and I'll stress particularly cultural identification, is the extent to which a Chicano will identify himself consciously as being a Chicano. Culture and cultural identification are used by the dominant society in order to identify Chicanos in general. This is one of the ways in which culture specifically enters into the discussion of the internal colony.

Now the central aspect of internal colonialism for me - the central definition of internal colonialism - has to do with the control of, or the influence over, institutions. I think that in taking a look at colonization as it has existed in other places and other times, the aspect is that the institutions of a particular people, institutions of a particular race, are controlled externally, that is, by another group of people, by people who define themselves differently in terms of cultural or racial identification. So it is that rather than, for example, something like economic exploitation being the defining characteristic of colonialism. I think the one thing that all colonialism has in common is this aspect of external control; that is, control comes from the outside. In the case of the Chicano, I think the central thing here is that this control is exercised through the control of institutions, and through denying Chicanos control over, and influence over the institutions which affect their own lives. When I say institutions here, I mean political institutions, economic institutions and social institutions, such as governmental agencies, the school system, political parties, the economic institutions of the barrio, elected political bodies, city councils, legislatures, the mass media, and all of the other institutions that directly affect the lives of the Chicanos. All of these institutions are controlled from outside the Chicano community. It is the control of the institutions from the outside, and the denial of that control or influence to Chicanos that defines the situation of internal colonialism for us a cultural/racial group.

The second general point, which follows from this first one, is that as a result of this condition of powerlessness, various other conditions ensue. One is that Chicanos individually are maintained in a condition of disadvantage - a disadvantage of various kinds, economic disadvantage, cultural disadvantage and so forth - that is, lack of access in personal terms to those things which they would otherwise be entitled if they were not part of a colonized people. One aspect of that denial or disadvantage is occupational opportunity, with which we're primarily concerned here. Occupational opportunity is only one aspect of it, but it is a very important aspect. What I am saying is that Chicanos are identified as being a separate community which is denied access to those institutions which control it or influence it. As a result of being denied that influence various conditions follow, and one of the conditions or situations that follows from that is the denial of occupational opportunity. It is only by looking at it in structural terms, and taking a look at the position of Chicanos as a whole within the American system that it is possible truly to establish the relationship between culture and occupational opportunity.

Again I want to stress the way identification of the Chicano - of himself as a chicano - is one crucial issue. It is from this identification that circumstances or situations tend to follow.

To make the discussion a little more concrete, I can draw circumstances or situations from my own experience at an educational institution in which I was once employed. I found myself in a situation where the longer I stayed in the institution, the more I tended to identify myself as a Chicano in terms of the really important matters - in the way in which I related to my work, in the way in which I did my work, and the kind of work I was interested in doing. As I became more and more closely identified with the Chicano community in my work, I found that the negative reaction pressures from the people surrounding me became stronger and stronger. These people were non-Chicanos and controlled the institution. It became evident to me, and it was strongly implied on more than one occasion, that if my identification, and those things which came from that identification - that is the direction of my work, the way in which I saw my work, and the kind of work I was interested in doing - continued in the direction they were going that probably I would suffer in one way or another. So I was denied the kind of occupational opportunity mobility within that institution that would otherwise be available to me. As one of the results of these pressures, I found myself leaving that institution and going to another. My case I think is a very concrete example of the way in which occupational opportunity, in this case in a profession, is denied to a person who identifies himself with a particular culture, and who follows through on that identification.

Another aspect that follows from this denial of control over institutions is that Chicanos find themselves subjected to cultural attack. That is, as a body, individually, and as a group, they find themselves subjected to cultural attack. I would refer to this as "cultural imperialism." This kind of cultural attack I think is manifested through such things as the schools and the mass media, two of the crucial institutions as far as Chicanos are concerned, and two of the institutions over which they in fact lack control and lack influence. It is because of that lack of control and lack of influence that the larger system is able to use those institutions in such a way as to attack the Chicano culture. Now, the kind of attack the Chicanos find themselves subjected to are essentially aimed at furthering the acculturation of Chicanos, that is, the elimination of a separate cultural identity. The control of these institutions is used in order to enforce this direction of acculturation. Through external control of those institutions there are certain penalties or certain sanctions which are attached to people who find themselves adopting a cultural identity and following through on that identification. As a consequence of this control Chicanos find themselves being denied equal occupational opportunity. As a further result they find themselves being denied equal educational opportunities. Finally, through being denied equal educational opportunities, that is, through the consequence of high drop-out rates and generally poor educational experience of Chicanos, the lack of occupational opportunity tends to be reinforced. So the school system acts as the major gate keeper in our society as regards occupational mobility. The Chicano community in such a situation find itself faced with several choices. One is that it can essentially abandon its identity by becoming acculturated. I would call this the strategy of individual mobility in order to improve the occupational opportunity of Chicanos - the consequence of following a strategy of individual mobility in order to improve the occupational opportunity of Chicanos. The second choice that Chicanos are given by the present system is to maintain our identity but to accept the sanctions which the system then imposes on us. This is a status quo strategy since it is the situation as it presently exists. In other words, as a price for maintaining that identity you accept the penalties that are imposed by the larger system. The third choice that I see that Chicanos have - and it is not a choice that is given to them but it is a choice which perhaps they can make on their own - is to maintain their identity, but to struggle collectively, which means to struggle politically, to gain control of existing institutuions, and to create their own alternative **institutions.** This I would call the strategy of de-colonization. The way in which I orient myself to work as a Chicano political scientist is in terms of this latter strategy, which is to work out viable strategies of de-colonization. A lot more needs to be said as to what would be involved in a strategy of that sort. Let me just say now that in order to adopt this strategy, a large number of Chicanos need to struggle collectively, and they have to aim at gaining control of those institutuions, or at least gain a very significant influence over those institutions that affect their lives, or create alternative institutions which would allow them to maintain their identity and at the same time not be penalized for it.

## Clarification Questions

Seña: It seems that you are saying that the penalties imposed once the Chicano Identity is maintained is that there is a systematic move to penalize the person for such identification. Do you see this also as structural as well? Is it a formal thing that happens or just informal in your view?

Barrera: I think that you would have to call it structural. Black scholars and political activists who have addressed themselves to this problem talk about institutional racism, and this is essentially what is involved. That is, it is not necessarily a formal position that is taken by an institution, but the workings of that institution operate in such a way as to have a racist, or, as I would prefer to call it, an imperialist or colonial effect on Chicanos. It is structural in the sense that the workings of the institutions, the normal workings you might say, of the institutions tend to enforce that kind of colonial status.

Raigoza: But isn't it true that the internal or domestic colonial model fundamentally is based on the notion of racism?

Barrera: Racism and culturalism enter into it if racism is conceived as being a general category or situation, and not necessarily just a biological matter, and that race can be partly defined on cultural grounds. I think very important for a Chicano is the question of self identification - whether in fact he is willing to say he is a Chicano, and, willing to act like a Chicano. So the situation is racist if you take culture to be part of the definition of race.

Lara: When you mention de-colonization, are you dealing with the concept of Chicanos taking over in the physical location, that is, in the Barrio? If so, would that mean taking over? Or is the pattern of de-colonization you are talking about one where the Chicano is diffused into the general society?

Barrera: In order to actually gain influence or control over institutions Chicanos have to retain physical proximity to each other. But I'm not saying that the situation necessarily means just taking over institutions in the barrio. Note, for example, that the mass media is not located in the barrio in terms of where the control is. What is meant is gaining influence or control over those institutions which have an effect on Chicanos whether they live in the barrio or not.

Lara: Are you implying that physical proximity is required in order to maintain Chicano culture? Will a Chicano be a Chicano in Hollywood?

Barrera: I would say that he would maintain his identity over a longer period of time through physical proximity. That is a little bit out of my area. I would defer to an anthropologist or a sociologist on that particular question.

Juan Gomez

I wish to make a number of preparatory remarks. One is that I approach history from the definition that it is the analytical investigation of identified problems in the past, from the perspective of configurations present in contemporary society. I am not interested in history as story telling. I believe that the function of history is to provide analysis, and to suggest alternatives as seen from the point of view of a historian. The point of reference must be the contemporary society.

I think that four outstanding aspects of the historical record as regards the Chicano are: the process of subjugation that is a legacy of war; the dramatic increase of numbers of population that begins to occur in the 19th century; the increasing means of communication; and the process of urbanization. If one looks at any number of social science studies - setting aside whether one likes them or dislikes them or takes exception to the terms they use to describe Chicanos - the major fault that runs across all of them, including those done by Chicanos, is the fact that much of their analysis is hindered by the lack of historical depth. As a result these social scientists often come to what they consider novel discoveries, and make certain assertions we are familiar with, such as those that are covered in the labels "emergent," "development of consciousness," "the development of participation," etc., and usually these developments are placed within the time span 1945 to the present. When one looks across the spectrum of problems besetting the community, when one looks at the tactics and the values operating socially, most of these are historical; they date from the 19th century. Most of the larger aspects of Chicano history also date from the late 19th century. The rhetoric states that for the Chicano the crucible is the 19th century. Indeed it is, but insufficient analysis is made of the 19th century. One of the reasons is the lack of coherent narratives and historical frameworks for that period from a Chicano point of view, and often ignorance of the literature, which if scanned would provide at least minimal information or the kind of backdrop that contemporary social scientists should have.

I think that the overall way to approach Chicano history is to approach it from the models and perspectives provided by the theory of social change. What I'm going to say here may sound somewhat banal, but what I want to stress is, that this kind of approach has not be used sufficiently in Chicano history. Social change is the alternation within the order of human organization. This is an operative definition; it refers to differences in structures and configurations observed over time. Clearly significant social change involves both objective conditions and orientations of attitudes. Though some degree of change is constantly occurring, structural change is at specific historical moments more pronounced than others. It should be pointed out that changes in attitudes can occur without apparently great alternation in social structures, and changes in objective conditions may occur without readily affecting values or attitudes. To study Chicano history through the framework of social change enables us to judge internal and external elements influencing the Chicano community at a certain time. We also have to pay attention to the forces of social order, and those forces that operate to maintain balance and avoid crisis, usually what political scientists and others refer to when they talk about colonial institutions and practices. Chicano history spans from about 1598 to the present. The outstanding benchmark is the year 1848, of course. In the years prior to the 1900s probably the outstanding characteristics and periods are the following: settlement and expansion, the development of culture, the development of institutions, the practices of political partisanship or factionalism, inter-ethnic contact, cultural and economic conflict, resistance and subordination. From 1600 to 1800 is the period of settlement: the period 1800 to 1830, is a period of relative florescence of a frontier culture; the period 1830 to 1848 is characterized by conflict; the period 1848 to 1870 involves resistance and accomodation; and the period 1870 to 1900 involves subordination and accommodation. During this time you have the basis for later land preference, the claims to cultural charter membership, distinctive subcultures elaborated, as well as regional differentiations of this subculture - that is, a chicano culture plus differentiations of this, what we refer to as "Tejano," "Nuevo Mexicano," "Californiano," and so forth. We also have the definition of mutual ethnic stereotypes, that is, the way we are perceived, the way we perceive the other. During the 19th century are cast the social political economic relations that govern Chicano people and Anglo society from that time to the present.

When one looks at the historical record, one sees that the outstanding events, or aspects of it, is the colonialization that takes place during the 19th century, the increasing fragmentation of Chicano values and culture during the 19th century, which though slow continues and is continuing to the present. The recurring effort is trying to realign the situation, that is, to end aspects of subordination, to end the process of fragmentation. We are going through one of those periods presently. The historical record seems to indicate that the success of this process is always problematical, and that to date it has not been particularly successful. A prognosis for the future is an increasingly worsening situation for the Chicano at all levels. But perhaps even worse, because it had not occurred so markedly as has been occurring since World War II, is the erosion of the culture, that is, the increasing and accelerating rate of assimilation.

My concern, then, as regards our discussion topic of Chicano culture and occupational opportunities, is how the possible disjunctions between the two will affect the process of fragmentation, the erosion of our culture, and the increase of accelerating rate of assimilation. Our topic itself implicitly, for instance, suggests accommodation for both parties involved, but with the Chicano losing culturally more than what he gains economically. Isn't this what we are actually directing ourselves to - Chicano culture identification loss for supposedly culture-free economic gain? Given such an atmosphere of accomodation, which for the Chicano is more like total surrender, I do not see any reversing of the current process of cultural fragmentation.

Yamil Lara

As an economist I am faced with the problem of attempting to determine what, if anything, characterize the Chicano culture with respect to occupational opportunity. Allow me to refer to some basic economic postulates for this purpose and then try to view the Chicano vis-a-vis the postulates. I will begin by saying that normally in this society, where there are some levels of competition, a man's wage is usually related to his productivity - to how much he produces for his firm or agency. A skilled worker, because of his productivity, usually receives a higher wage than an unskilled worker. In addition, the salary of any worker (for that matter of any good) is a function of two things. It is a function of supply of that good or service and a demand of that good or service. Now what happens in terms of the Chicano? Let us consider unskilled labor momentarily. There is a very large supply of unskilled labor in this society, and there is a limited demand for unskilled labor. The result is very low wages. In comparison the supply of skilled labor is somewhat limited, the demand for skilled labor is very high. The result is higher wages. If we turn to the Chicano, we find an exceedingly high percentage of Chicanos in unskilled or semi-skilled job categories, with a very low percentage in the professional, managerial, or highly skilled classes. Can we explain it in some way, can we relate it to the culture of the Chicano? Remember that eighty percent of Chicanos are found in low-skilled, unskilled, or semi-skilled classes.

Economists in the past few years have been very interested in the concept of investment in human beings. That is, the amount of investment in the individual to a large extent determine the total earnings an individual will make in his lifetime. The average citizen in the U.S. - by the age of 22 - has invested a very large amount in himself. He has done this in two ways: One, the formal education provided by the community, from public funds. The second one has been the salary he has given up while he is going to school. He has forgone considerable amounts of income during the four-year stay in college, plus he was also giving up some income while in high school. In addition there are other investments made in the individual. When a person obtains employment, whether it is with a firm or the government, there is additional training provided for the employee. The firm invests in the individual through executive training, managerial programs, or even training in special skills. Relating this to the Chicano, we find that a very large number of Chicanos have very low levels of investment as individuals. They lack in most instances professional or advanced training. Let me advance some reasons why I think that partially as a result of the culture of the Chicano and to a large extent the impact of discrimination that this is the case.

The first and most critical reason is that the initial stages of learning for a Chicano tend to be more expensive than that of the Anglo to achieve the same educational result. Chicanos at an early age, as a result of their bi-lingualism, in order to achieve the same level of education - let us say the same reading proficiency - need a higher level of expenditure per pupil than the Anglo. Chicanos need bi-lingual training, special books, and special programs - all these are expensive, more expensive than a comparable Anglo program. The unforunate reality is that as a result of their bilingualism or their bi-lingual culture, Chicanos need a higher expenditure per pupil during the primary years, but they in fact due to discrimination get less than the Anglo in terms of expenditure per student. Chicanos because of their lack of political power do not obtain the same expenditure per student. So the initial investment made for Chicano students is much lower than that made for Anglo students. There is also a result of types of discrimination. The type of discrimination with which we are familiar is overt discrimination in terms of the individual's civil rights. But there is another kind of discrimination which I consider to be more expensive in the long run. It is that discrimination which is made in the allocation of public monies. Public expenditures which are made, not by the individual, but are made by governmental bodies, essentially discriminate against the Chicano because of the housing pattern of Chicanos: They live in a barrio or in a well defined geographical area. If you examine the pattern of public spending, you will find that public schools in Chicano areas are neglected. They have a lower expenditure per pupil than the Anglo areas. The discriminatory pattern of public spending is more pervasive than this because recreational opportunities, medical facilities, and the general welfare of the Chicano is to a large extent determined by the pattern of public spending.

The second point is that Chicanos, due to the lower level of income, are less able to give up wages that could be earned while they are obtaining additional education. Remember that forgone wages constitute a real cost to the Chicano. When he goes to high school, or when he is in college, he not only has to pay the additional expense of tuition, books, etc., he also has to face the expense of not being able to earn during this period. So, the special training, professional training or even college training cannot easily be afforded by a low income Chicano. This result is due to the low levels of income of the Chicano families, and more specifically in terms of the Chicano culture, to families having a larger number of children. That means that the expenditure per child in a Chicano family, given the same family income, compared to the Anglo family, is much lower. So the probability of that Chicano family of being able to afford to send a child to college is much lower than that of the Anglo family, which has fewer children. Fewer children essentially means a higher expenditure or the ability to make higher expenditure per child. So we have two things: one, Chicano families income is lower than the Anglo; two, the expenditure per child in a Chicano family is lower yet because of the higher number of children.

The third point is that the lack of general education on the part of a Chicano also works against him. I am defining general education as a liberal arts degree or high school education. This lack of general education makes the employer very reluctant to invest in a Chicano for a managerial or white collar position. A prospective employer who is searching for a managerial trainee will be faced with some training costs per managerial trainee. If he hires a Chicano, as compared to an Anglo, he will pay higher costs of training if he has to hire a Chicano vis-a-vis an Anglo because the Anglo has had the benefit of higher investment prior to his being hired. He has had on the average a higher level of education.

So a Chicano presents to the prospective employer a higher expenditure in terms of the training than for his Anglo counterpart.

Let me now summarize: occupational opportunities of Chicanos will continue to be highly limited so long as the above pattern continues. We need to recognize several critical points. Chicano training calls for more money than Anglo training, and this is critical at the early stages. We also need to recongize that Chicanos are less able to afford to give up wages during a training period. And, third, firms hiring Chicanos pay higher costs than if they hire Anglos for the same training program. As a result of a pattern of discriminatory public expenditures, Chicanos have obtained much lower levels of investment from educational institutions financed from public funds. Chicanos need more funds than Anglos to achieve the same educational results, but they have received less. Finally, Chicanos have larger families and have lower family incomes,a combination that results in a very low expenditure in the education of the children by the family.

## Clarification Questions

Raigoza: Let us assume that you have a Chicano and an Anglo who are both graduates of the same college with the same liberal arts background. Are you saying that the Chicano would still require greater financial investment per return in comparison to the Anglo?

Lara: No. I am saying that the probability of a Chicano reaching the same level of education as the Anglo is much lower because there has been a bias in the public expenditure against the Chicano since his early years. I should add the following: the quality of education the Chicano receives might be quite different from that of the Anglo. We have to remember that a high school education or a high school diploma from one high school is not exactly the equivalent of the high school education or diploma from another. There are qualitative differences, and these qualitative differences result in different training costs for the employer if he is going to hire a high school graduate. So he is more likely to hire a graduate from a good high school than to hire a graduate from a poor high school.

Raigoza: I would like you to return to another question. What if you had this Anglo who graduates with a liberal arts background versus the Chicano who graduates with a liberal arts background who is being considered for some kind of managerial position.

Lara: In that case, so long as you postulate that they have had the same educational experience, then the costs faced by the prospective employer would be the same.

Raigoza: Do you feel that the employer would still prefer to employ the Anglo?

Lara: If so, the situation would be one of discrimination, not a function of cost. What I am saying is that sometimes the employer is making a rational decision, let's say a profit-oriented decision when he is reluctant to hire a

Chicano, vis-a-vis Anglos, because Chicanos may present higher costs to him during a training program. In other cases the employer may simply be exercising his discriminatory bias when he refuses to hire a Chicano.

Amado M. Padilla

I would like to perhaps change the focus here just a little bit, and move into the realm of social-psychological perspectives in relation to the Chicano and the occupations. In terms of a socio-psychological analyses, I would like to focus on some of the reasons that have been given for the small number of Chicanos in the various vocations, occupations, professions, etc. There are a number of reasons that can be found in the social science literature. I would like to go through some of these, and then perhaps spend a little bit of time analyzing some of them.

The first is that the social organization of the Chicano family hinders economic and occupation advancement of a Chicano. The usual explanation here is that the Chicano family places obligations upon the offspring of the family, which are greater than they are in the Anglo family. Some of the obligations that we are talking about here are, for instance, financial obligations. The young Chicano student may contribute to the support of his family because of socio-economic considerations. As a consequence he cannot pursue his education. Another thing that you find in literature that is very profound is that the social organization of the Chicano family in addition to the financial obligation creates a situation where the young Chicano person is unwilling to move far beyond his family in terms of a geographic location. So he finds himself bound in a close physical proximity to his family and in this sense he becomes limited in the vocations, occupations, and professions that he may seek. This is one of the things that usually appears in such an analysis.

Another thing that one commonly finds in the literature is that the Chicano has a personality type that may be characteristic of what might be called acceptance and appreciation of things as they are, that there is something in a Chicano family life style which makes him complacent with life as it is. Another thing one finds as you go through this kind of analysis is the often repeated statement that the Chicano is fatalistic. In his compliance he accepts things as they are and as they come. He sees himself in a helpless, hopeless, powerless kind of situation - a hopeless situation in which he cannot do anything to change his world - to try to get into a vocation, an occupation, or a profession which he would like but for obvious socio-economic reasons cannot because of the reasons touched upon earlier. He sees barriers and there's nothing he can do about them, and he accepts that fatality. Another thing, and this is perhaps the most common characteristic that one finds in a social psychological analysis, is that the Chicano lacks a future orientation, that he is present time bound. There is nothing he does that is future orientated, so we're told. I might quote William Madsen on this point. This is what Madsen says about this fatalistic attitude, coupled with the lack of future orientation: "Because God rather than man is viewed as controlling events the Latin lacks the future orientation of the Anglo and the Anglo's passion for planning ahead. Many Mexican Americans consider it presumptious to try to plan for tomorrow, because human beings are merely servants of God, and it is He who plans the future." So according to a social psychological analysis we Chicanos place our hands in God, and

God determines our future rather than we ourselves.

A fifth thing that one often finds in the literature is that the Chicano is unable to defer gratification: he cannot plan for the future, he cannot prepare himself for the future. Why? Because he cannot defer gratification. He needs to have his satisfactions now. As we all well know, in a pursuit of a profession for example, getting through school requires that we have this ability to defer gratification. We've got to be able, for instance, as we've been told, to sit back and pursue our studies, and decide that we want to take an economic loss for a few years.

A sixth point that one often finds is that in Chicano culture there is a censure or a disapproval for advancement, so if you try to get too far beyond your family and your culture this is disapproved, this is frowned upon. Then the Chicano would rather, as the story goes, remain inconspicuous within his culture, and not try to move beyond it. A seventh point that one often finds is that the Chicano is noncompetitive: he has a system of noncompetitive values. Noncompetitiveness hinders school achievement. As the analysis goes he is not competitive and he doesn't do well in school, therefore why in the world would you expect him to be in the professions? An eighth point is that he suffers from tremendous language handicaps, that he never really learns English, and as we are told by educators, neither does he know Spanish. So he suffers from an inabliity to function in either language. Unless one can function in a language, one cannot get ahead.

Now, the question is, do analyses such as these lead to the inference that a Chicano is less dependable, less efficient than the

Anglo in the work situation? The inference has been answered yes by the Anglo employer. The Anglo employer takes these eight major points and says, "This is good justification for me not to hire a Chicano. All these things work to his detriment - to his being less dependable, less efficient. Why should I risk my money, my time in training him so that he won't perform for me?" The real question, I think, is whether these attitudes held by employers are stereotypes, prejudicial kinds of attitude, or in actuality are there facts that support the reasons given for not hiring Chicanos. And in trying to answer this question I did some homework and tried to come up with some literature which might bear on this question. I came up with a number of studies which I won't cite here, but can furnish, if you're interested, at a later time.

I will mention the name of Charles Weaver. What Weaver has done is to study the eight points I've run through to see if there was any legitimacy to them. What he has done is to study a number of various occupations in San Antonio to see if Mexican Americans are in fact less dependable, less efficient, etc. By analyzing things such as sick leaves, accidents, job performance rating, the seeking of job advancements, etc., he has shown that for all intents and purposes absolutely no difference exists whatsoever between Chicano and Anglo employees. He studied firemen, police, and various kinds of housing authority employees, etc. He finds that Chicanos don't take sufficiently more sick leave than do Anglos, which is something you might expect, if they are not future oriented for they would rather have their gratification today, and the heck with work. If they are really less efficient workers you would expect them to have more accidents, which they don't have. In terms of job performance ratings, no difference. In terms of seeking job advancements, they are every bit as concerned as their Anglo counterparts in seeking promotions and advancement. As a matter of fact, in one of his studies, I think, on policemen, he found that the Chicano policemen were looking for an advancement and promotion at a significantly greater rate than were their Anglo counterparts. So what some of these data show is that Chicanos are capable workers and that the eight points examined earlier are probably more stereotypic responses that employers give for not hiring Chicanos.

Now I would like to shift for a few minutes and spend a little time analyzing what the situation is like in the mental health fields, in which I happen to be more interested as a psychologist. A recent survey which was published in the American Psychologist found that one percent of the psychologists of this country had Spanish surnames. This includes Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Spaniards, South Americans, Central Americans, Mexicans. Of this number, I think 85, approximately twenty Chicanos, have their Ph.D. in psychology. The same survey reported that ½ of one percent of all psychiatrists in this country had Spanish surnames. The percentage is even considerably smaller if you look for Spanish surnamed psychiatrists who are Chicano. I would doubt if you could find maybe more than five. At least one of the problems that Chicanos have had in the mental health fields, should they go through a Ph.D. or through a residency training in psychiatry, is that they have often been unable to find employment in areas where they might be of service to Chicanos.

They find themselves being employed in universities and clinics, medical school, etc. outside of Chicano areas. If you look and try to locate these Chicano Ph.D.s for instance, you would find very few of them in Chicano areas. One of the questions that comes up is, why? And more important, why such a small number of Chicanos in psychology and psychiatry? I think the answers to those questions are fairly obvious. First of all to get into psychology or psychiatry a person has to spend anywhere from eight to twelve years in the University. This is the first problem as we know. And this is related to all of the socio-economic problems already mentioned. You don't find that many Chicanos in higher education, or at least you haven't until very recently. Aside from this, departments of psychiatry, departments of psychololology in terms of the programs they offer are not too tremendously concerned with minority groups problems, with problems which affect Chicanos, for instance. Many of the stereotypes that I ran through are stereotypes which have in part originated in psychological research and I would probably venture to say that many of the stereotypes that continue to persist about minorities, and especially Chicanos in this case, derive from the works of various psychologists. So programs are not relevant to Chicanos, and even when they are relevant in social psychology, or clinical psychology, or counseling, you really cannot find Chicanos getting into graduate programs for a number of different reasons. The major reason is that they don't come up to the imposed standards of academic excellence that many universities and departments would like. Moreover, many graduate programs are still insistent that the "standards" must be maintained and are reluctant to be flexible in the admission policies where Chicanos are concerned. There is also the problem of financial support. In my own department, for instance, the entering graduate student has on the average a G.P.A. close to a 4.0 in psychology and a 3.5 overall. This makes competition for graduate fellowships fierce for all students and especially for Chicanos should they want to apply. Aside from that, programs in psychology are for the most part experimental rather than applied. In terms of the way many Chicano students come into psychology, it is apparent that the applied areas of psychology are more relevant than the more traditional experimental psychological orientation. There are a number of ways to alleviate this kind of problem, but this is not the time to do so.

## Clarification Questions

Barrera: You mentioned among the eight stereotypes that Chicanos are bound to their family, and this would limit their mobility. You never answered whether or not this idea is stereotyping.

Padilla: My guess is that it is a stereotype. I suspect the limited mobility implied here is related to a number of socioeconomic considerations all of which mean that the individual cannot go very far from his family.

Jaime J. M. Raigoza

Let me begin by discussing the socioeconomic status of Chicanos. A report issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce states in 1960 at least 83% of Mexican Americans were engaged in factories, mines, construction, farm, and service occupations. Even this figure may be conservative because professional and clerical occupations are classified together. The Mexican American professional and clerical occupation category is listed at 17%. If we may assume half of this latter category constitutes the clerical sector, we can safely conclude 92% of the Mexican Americans labor force is non-professional. Undeniably in 1960 Mexican Americans may be categorized as constituting a blue-collar community. In this report, readers were urged to be counted in the 1970 census such that specific demographic data might be accumulated on the Mexican American. As we all know, there was no specific provision allowed in order to count Mexican Americans in the 1970 census. There was a category for Negroes, or Blacks — depending upon ideological persuasion. There were categories for other ethnic groups, Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and the like. Unfortunately, I think it is indefensible that the 1970 census excluded a category by which Mexican Americans could be counted. If the 1970 census had included data on Chicanos, we would have a least a ten year period by which to make some comparative assessment on social mobility in the occupational sector. It seems to be an administrative prerogative as to how we are classified and non-classified. Thus our discussion is hampered by a lack of official statistics. Nonetheless, there is every reason to conclude that in 1970, the Chicano community still constitutes an overwhelmingly blue-collar working status. So the question before us seems to be, why does the Chicano continue to occupy the status of a blue-collar worker in American society, and almost nothing more?

Given our discussion topic, Chicano culture and occupational opportunities, I would not focus on the Chicano culture as if it were operating in a "social vacuum." I would prefer to ask, how do Anglos structure occupational opportunities for Chicanos? Above all, we experience structured inequality. I share Mario Barrera's view of considering a domestic colonial model, rather than considering Chicano culture as "pathological."

The Chicano for all intents and purposes occupies a neo-colonial status in American society. Life opportunities that are available for Chicanos are not the same compared to Anglos. Anglos assume that all Americans have equal access to opportunity structures. Obviously this isn't the case. I believe we can credit Dr. Ernesto Galarza for a pertinent analysis of the bracero and Mexican farm worker here in California. For example, even though Mexicans and Mexican Americans were to be found working on the farms since the earliest stages of agri-economy in California, it is interesting to note that Mexican Americans did not emerge as a class of small farm land owners. In addition Mexican Americans were not expected to be political activists. The social institutions that to serve Chicanos failed, namely, schools, welfare, and so on. Finally, the Chicano laborer was to mysteriously appear at harvest time, and then mysteriously disappear when the harvest was over. The point to be understood is individuals achieve efficacy only to the extent that institutions are working for him and in his behalf. Otherwise, regardless of motivation, an individual is seriously hampered in realizing his potential.

Along these lines, let's consider an article by Schuman, which I think is applicable to the Chicano in large measure. Schuman in Transaction discusses opinions about the perceived difference in intelligence between blacks and whites. In 1940, 57% of the Anglos polled affirmed the same position. I'm sure that if a survey were taken today comparing black and white differences in intelligence, most people would probably conclude that whites are no more intelligent than blacks and vice versa. But we are still left with a problem — if there isn't any difference in intelligence between blacks and whites, why haven't blacks been able to achieve more than their present standing? The explanation in the survey held because blacks were not highly motivated, that is, if they worked harder they could achieve the same position as the Anglo counterpart. Failing to acknowledge the full impact of discrimination when "free-will" is applied to minorities by whites, Schuman feels it is a racist explanation. Further, in the occupational marketplace, employers set up other stereotypes that carry themes of "competence" and "incompetence." The majority community tells Chicanos if one improves by accumulating the necessary kinds of degrees, skills, and training, competence will be rewarded. Due to the impact of discrimination in American society, the Chicano must possess impeccable qualifications to compensate for the stereotype that the employer may have in his mind — the questioned quality of the

Chicanos performance on the job. Let us assume that the Chicano has to perform 110% where his counterpart might be operating at 85% level of productivity. Once again, the burden of "quality performance" is placed on the shoulder of the minority person.

In review, first, we have no comparative data to judge if any occupational mobility has taken place since 1960 because of the failure of the 1970 census to provide statistics for us on the Chicano. Second, the Chicano essentially occupies a neo-colonial status in America today, and as such is viewed as subordinate and inferior. Third, a model which seems to provide an explanation of the conditions of minorities is the notion of domestic colonialism. I have given a brief example of the farm workers plight in California. We may well ask what is the future of Chicano farm workers in the San Joaquin Valley? As mechanization continues, the Chicano laborer will be displaced. And, as a writer in *Transaction* noted, we have reached a new stage in terms of moving from the economics of exploitation to the economics of uselessness! Four, it seems that this country is faced with the proposition of trying to find gainful employment for highly trained white technicians. To the extent that public expenditures are provided in these areas, and if we assume furthermore that these public expenditures are limited, we may legitimately raise the question, will a priority be placed on upgrading Chicanos and other minorities? I submit to you that those interests will be negligible because in a society that is not able to put white technicians to work, why should it be overly zealous in trying to provide training to develop Chicano technicians?

## OPEN DISCUSSION

Seña: I would like to begin the open discussion by focusing on a general question that would seem to apply to several of you. Although I may isolate one or two of you in order to direct you to the question, it is something that I wanted to ask continually of all of you during your various presentations. It seemed to me several times that what was being spoken of was the conditions in which a particular population group, in this case our own Chicano group, finds itself at this present time, and has found itself historically -- a colonized group in the way that this was talked about, and a group not properly known about for a variety of reasons. Now, dealing principally with the first of these two situations -- a group that finds iself in a particular status or set of conditions, economic blue-collar, colonized, or what have you -- I couldn't gather whether or not if Chicano population itself must bear responsibility for this status or conditions, because of what might be identified as culture factors of whatever kind. For instance, you, Yamil (Lara), place the bulk of Chicano workers in a particular condition of low-skill, and, therefore, low-commodity exchange ability in terms of their labor. Could you respond as to whether or not you are able to talk at all how the group itself might be responsible for this situation?

Lara: Let me clarify something you said at the end. In theory, the salary a worker receives is a reflection of how much he is able to bring to the labor market in terms of skill. I tried to pinpoint two things in Chicano culture which I felt gave some of the reasons for the occupational distribution of the Chicano. I tried to point out that there is lower investment in Chicanos than in Anglo counterparts for two reasons. One is the pattern of public expenditure -- biases against the Chicano so that he gets a poor training during his school years. The second point is the lower level of investment made on the individual as a result of his family having a higher number of children per family. Essentially, the family that has more children is only able to afford lower levels of expenditures per child. The low level of expenditures is reflected in the amount of training, the amount of education, the amount of medical care, the number of educational experiences the child is exposed to during his childhood and youth, etc. So he at the end obtains a lower level of investment than other individuals who come from families that are smaller, the expenditures per child in these families being higher. I also tried to stress in terms of patterns of public expenditures the following: not only are public expenditures biased against Chicanos as a result of discrimination, but in addition a Chicano, in order to achieve the same level of reading proficiency, or other educational proficiencies as his Anglo counterpart -- requires a higher than average expenditure. The Chicano requires more money than the Anglo simply because he requires programs which are tailored to fit his bi-cultural background. This means that all of these additional programs — bi-lingual programs, bi-cultural programs, programs calling for special equipment -- are costly programs, and more costly than similar Anglo programs. Although I don't think we want to say that the Chicano culture is "responsible" for the higher level of expenditure required by the Chicano, such factors as bilingualism, which produces higher costs, and larger families, which results in lower levels of investment per child, are two "cultural" factors that should be considered in trying to explain the present levels of training and the occupational structure of the Chicano.

Seña: Then at this point of time such factors must be seen as detracting from occupational opportunities in the sense that they contribute to the cost of expanding them?

Lara: We can try to approach the problem and its solution in two ways. First, the Chicano family must be made aware that while it is otherwise fine to have additional children, doing so in effect is deciding to have lower expenditure per child, and that each child is not as well off as when there are fewer children. Second the public must be made aware of the needs of the Chicano as being not only the same as the Anglo, but actually requiring a higher level of expenditure if the Chicano is expected to be equally trained or to have the same occupational opportunity as the Anglo. What I'm saying in effect is that the Chicano does not need *equal* opportunity, he needs *more than* equal opportunity: he needs favored treatment from society at large in order for him to obtain the same level of training.

Seña: Let me move to Mario (Barrera) with the same question, and perhaps also Jaime (Raigoza) as well, because both of you dealt with a colonization model of analysis for determining the status of Chicano population. Mario, do you think there is anything integral to Chicano population per se which helps account for the kind of colonization that you speak of as regards occupational opportunities?

Barrera: I think Chicanos are responsible for their situation in regard to occupational opportunities to the extent that they want to stay Chicano, to the extent that Chicanos have wanted to maintain their cultural identity. But only in this sense are Chicanos "responsible" for the situation many find themselves in, in whatever terms we may be speaking about. I think the overall question has to do with how much you accept the idea that the future society should look like the present society, or how much you accept of the present societal structure as being unchangable, or as being the correct kind of structure. If you accept the structure or system just the way it is, then the choice is very clear for the Chicano. It is either to acculturate or to suffer. I'll even put it stronger and say that the choice presented by Anglo society is either colonization or cultural genocide. That is the choice that is presented. If you are willing to work with Anglos and under this system, this is the kind of choice you will have to put up with. If you don't accept the system as being legitimate, and you call into question the system all along the line, then you enter into the realm of a third choice, into a strategy of de-colonization. Now, we really haven't had a chance to go into this idea of colonization in as much depth as I'd like. My feeling though, and to go one step further than I did in my presentation earlier, is that I think that this system is a colonial system by virtue of the normal workings of that system. I don't think the system has to go out of its way to colonize Chicanos, or to inflict disadvantages on the Chicano. Maybe it does, but I don't think it has to. I think the system is destructive of Chicanos collectively and individually just through its normal workings. Let me give you an example, and I think I can relate it to what Amado (Padilla) was talking about when he mentioned the idea that Chicanos are bound to their families, that the Chicano is not willing to pick up and leave his particular area for greater economic opportunities somewhere else. The Chicano is said to have less psychic mobility. He is tied to his family, or to his barrio, and he is not one to move to New York City or some where else in order to proceed in individual "upward" mobility. Now, this may be a stereotype. I myself don't know whether in fact Chicanos do have this kind of attitude or not. If they do, then perhaps they shouldn't, and perhaps Chicanos should give up these ties in the interest of this kind of individual mobility. I find the notion hard to accept for myself. But given the structure of the present system — economically, politically, socially, and every other way you can think of -- giving up these ties is probably the only choice that really exists. Either you adapt to the Anglo culture, or you suffer economic penalities. Usually when people write on this question it is to say that the Chicano should give up certain traits in order to take advantage of the greater mobility that would give him; that is, economic mobility. But if you don't accept the legitimacy of the system as it exists, then you have a third choice. It is to say that the industrial system which requires this kind of mobility, and which is structured along these lines, and which assumes that people are going to be atoms in the sense that the only considerations they are going to take into account is their own economic mobility -- this system has something wrong with it. It operates on a mono-cultural kind of basis. It is a culturally totalitarian kind of system. Any industrial system as it exists today -- whether it exists in the Soviet Union, or here in the United States, or Germany, wherever — operates on the same kind of assumption: a mono-cultural, atomistic kind of assumption. Now, if Chicanos are serious about changing their situation, and arriving at a fundamental de-colonization, then that means they are going to have to call the whole system into question. They are going to have to call into question the whole "normal" workings of the system. It is not enough to adapt yourself to that system, or to say, well, we are not going to adapt to it though we are going to remain in colonized status. I haven't done all the necessary research to back up what I'm saying now, but it does seem to me impressionistically that in order to arrive at an effective de-colonization for Chicanos, we must call into question not only that the way the system works doesn't come up to the way it is supposed to work, but we even have to call into question the way the system is supposed to work. Then we must set up a different kind of model. And I don't know of any model of that kind that has been established by anybody. The socialists, for instance, don't even come close to specifying that kind of model that would really result in de-colonization for Chicanos. In fact, my own feeling is that the establishing of a more equalitarian kind of system, which would reduce or even eliminate most of the barriers that currently fact Chicanos in the American system, would also result in even more rapid acculturation and destruction of the Chicano community than we have now in the United States. Chicanos wouldn't have to worry about being colonized any more in that kind of system, but they wouldn't have to worry about being Chicanos either.

Seña: I'd like us to return to another of Mario's (Barrera) examples, but change it a bit. Mario gave us an example of apparently how the system works. He put it in the frame of reference that if a Chicano insists on his Chicano identification, and I would presume also if the people surrounding him were to insist even if he didn't on identifying him as a Chicano, that what happens is something negative to the Chicano. His upward mobility, for instance, his promotional ability, or fulfilling himself in perhaps the occupation level that he has, is hampered in some way, if not taken away completely. Does this mean for instance that in a training program or situation say where the supervisor is made aware of the probability of such negative happening to be very high, and then into this department is introduced a Chicano, it is inevitable that such a negative happening will occur? Is there anything at all, within the workings of the system, that could be done to prevent this occurrence? Let me ask you what you think Jaime (Raigoza), since you also deal in terms of a colonial model.

Raigoza: I seriously doubt that the occurrence could be circumvented. One of the points I want to stress is when I talk about Mexican Americans being forced to assume a subordinate position, basic to this subordination is the notion of ascribed inferiority. Take the idea of work performance, which Amado (Padilla) alluded to. The data implies there is no substantial difference in the work performance of Chicanos and Anglos. Can we therefore assume to the extent that Chicanos demonstrate their professional competence, they will be rewarded with positions, duties, and responsibilities commensurate with the demonstration of competence? I seriously doubt it. So at issue here is not work performance, but rather the salience of ethnicity. By this I mean that discrimination will continue to be operative in spite of what I would view as the accumulation of credentials, skills and general ability.

Seña: Is what Jaime (Raigoza) says in accord with one of your earlier statements, Yamil (Lara)? I think you said that one is dealing with other than an economic decision if for instance you have two men, one of whom is Chicano and the other Anglo, with the Chicano slightly more qualified, and the employer does not choose the Chicano. Then we are dealing with discrimination or something else?

Lara: Not quite. We are still dealing in the economic area in this respect: the Chicano has to pay a premium for discriminatory practices. Essentially, if the employer is biased against one ethnic group, and he has a choice of hiring two individual at the same wage, he will choose an Anglo, let's say, because he is discriminating against Chicanos. But if the Chicano is willing to work at a lower wage, or if the Chicano is able to offer additional qualifications, or additional talents, or additional expertise, then the employer will consider hiring a Chicano at a lower wage, or hire the Chicano at the same wage, but with the Chicano having additional qualificiations than the Anglo. So the Chicano is essentially bearing the cost of discrimination either because he is obtained at a lower wage, or because he must present extra qualifications. Now, let's say if the employer is not biased -- which was assumed in the example I was trying to give earlier -- but he is trying to minimize his training costs, then he is less likely to hire the Chicano, or for that matter any person who has a lower level of training. Let us say we have two individuals, both with high school diplomas but one from a good Anglo high school and the other from a poorer barrio institution, and one individual is Chicano and the other an Anglo. Both apply for the same job. The employer is more likely to hire the Anglo, not because he is biased against the Chicano, but because of the better quality of education that the Anglo has received. It is simply that the Anglo will present lower training costs to the employer than the Chicano.

Seña: But suppose that an employer hires a Chicano without thinking much other than that the man seemed most promising for the particular job opening. Do you agree with Jaime (Raigoza) that it is impossible to circumvent the situation that this Chicano will suffer because of his ethnicity if he identifies or is identified as a Chicano?

Lara: I'm not sure what you mean by "suffer." Will he be given unpleasant tasks, will he be faced with additional work or extreme demands? The situation still fits that if someone identifies as a Chicano, and receives biased treatment because of this identification, then the Chicano in order to retain his position will have to do additional tasks, will have to put up with some sort of additional work, if he wants to retain that job. If he wants the same treatment as the Anglo, that is, expects the same treatment and lets the employer know as much, then the employer will have simply hired the Anglo instead. He will only hire -- assuming the bias, of course -- a Chicano if the Chicano is willing to accept lesser working conditions than the Anglo. But we are assuming that the employer is biased against Chicanos, which I will say is not an unlikely assumption.

Seña: What you are saying then is that the only way the situation is neutralized, in effect isn't neutralized at all. That is, the Chicano can maintain his occupational level, perhaps even advance, but in doing so he just has to suffer all sorts of possibilities of the sort you suggest.

Lara: Yes, he essentially bears the direct cost of discrimination, because if he would demand equal pay for equal work, he might not be hired. He has to offer equal work for lower pay in order to be hired. One thing that bothers me about the question of the job performance of Chicanos is that I was hoping we wouldn't misinterpret this type of data I consider this "after the fact" data. How an individual performs on his job is not as relevant I think to the occupational distribution of Chicanos as, let's say, in what occupations are Chicanos found, for instance, in San Antonio, Texas. A more interesting question is: what prevents Chicanos from being hired into specific occupations? I think that is a much more interesting question than, how do Chicanos perform once they are hired? Because once they are hired, they essentially have met the qualifications. But if you look at the distribution of the general working population of Los Angeles, and you classify it in terms of professional, managerial, and laborers, and then you compare the general distribution with Chicano distribution, you will find Chicano workers over represented in the lower sectors. What explains that skewed distribution, I think, it is much more interesting than trying to see if a Chicano professional acts the same way as his Anglo counterpart, I would say, yes, this performance is the same, of course. He is already there. But what prevented many Chicanos from reaching that type of a position? I think that question is much more interesting.

Padilla: I have a point of clarification. The data on job performance were in job occupations of the lower social economic strata such as janitors The highest these occupations went up were firemen and policemen. So we are really looking at the job performance of blue collar or semi-skilled workers, not job performance of professionals. But the point is well taken. The real question is, why aren't they in some of the professions? However, the data does show that even if Chicanos meet the minimum requirements to be a policeman, their job performances is going to be no different from their Anglo counterpart, contrary to popular belief about their abilities.

Lara: I would say that their job performance should be better than the Anglo counterpart, simply because of the lack of opportunities elsewhere. The Chicano who becomes a policeman is probably going to be a better policeman than the Anglo counterpart, because the Anglo has more occupational opportunities than the Chicano.

Padilla: That's a point that is well taken. As a matter of fact, one of the running themes throughout some of the literature I examined is that this point is true, that the Chicano probably is trying harder to be a good employee. He's got more to lose if he's not. If this is the case, then this is lots of future time orientation, contrary to the stereotype.

Raigoza: Can we draw from what has just been said that given the limited vocational opportunities presented to Mexican Americans, once these have been made available to them, the Mexican American will probably be a better employee than his Anglo counterpart?

Padilla: My answer is, probably yes, unless some extraordinary circumstance occurs which might incapacitate him psychologically or socially in some way. But he does have more to lose if he is not a good employee.

Raigoza: Then, if he is a better employee, why do we find perhaps seventeen percent unemployment in Los Angeles today?

**Padilla:** I think the situation is very clear. I think it is a matter of discrimination.

**Seña:** I would like to return to what seems to be the essential initial question. First of all, there is that, if the Chicano is going to increase or participate in occupational opportunities, that to do so he must be more than qualified per position to expect to be hired. For one thing, once on the job he is going to have to expect to do more than the job, and also suffer a variety of demands that aren't asked of non-chicano counterparts. Only in this way will he continue to succeed. Step per step, level per level, and even it would appear, profession by profession, this will occur, the only alternative to this situation is separate institutions, which I presume would mean Chicano factories, let us say.

**Barrera:** This whole thing about Chicano job performance -- I think that again we fall into a trap there if we accept the standards that are laid down by Anglos for how the job is to be performed. Let us say that a Chicano is going to go into a particular position. He is going to be a social worker, or a professor, or a doctor, or a white collar worker. There are no objective criteria for what is good job performance. What I've been able to observe about certain occupations is that once you get above a very low level of occupation, a lot of criteria are essentially subjective - how you respond to your supervisor, to your fellow workers, to your clients, and so on. Now what I see as a crucial issue here is not so much a Chicano being aske to perform in exactly the same way as the other people, but that there is no allowance for cultural diversity. The standards are simply

Anglo standards of what constitutes proper occupational behavior. As long as that is the case, it may in fact be that any Chicano who insists on being a Chicano, in behaving in Chicano ways, and in looking out for Chicano interests, will not be satisfying the accepted criteria for job performance. Let's say he is a Chicano social worker, and has Chicano clients. Suppose he is really looking out for the welfare of these Chicano clients, rather than for the generalized welfare of his supervisor. To this extent he may in fact "perform" less well than his Anglo counterpart who would deal with Chicano clients on different terms. Now, to the extent that we accept those criteria that Anglos set down we are asking the Chicano to give up his cultural identity in order to meet the job criteria and job specifications that are coming down from above and are essentially based on Anglo cultural standards. That is what I see as the crucial issue.

Raigoza: I would say that the Anglo standard seems to be a fluid, sliding one, when applied to themselves. However, when they apply it to other groups, it becomes a relatively constant one. It seems to me that the Anglo institutions are flexible and accommodate the needs of their community, but are rigid and unyielding when they are dealing with other ethnic communities. For example, we note that drugs have long been present in the barrios. For some time the social definition of a Chicano using drugs is he's a potential criminal who should be put in San Quentin. When drugs made heavy inroads into the white suburban communities, affecting Anglo youths, the definition changes and it becomes a medical problem, and a particular problem that requires emergency crash pads, the attention of the city council, the enlightened interests of the police, and the interest of all concerned parties in order to seek solutions to assist rather than incarcerate these youths.

Barrera: I recognize that kind of problem. What I'm saying though is that it isn't the most fundamental problem we face. It seems to me that even if that particular problem were eliminated so that the same standards were being applied to Anglos and Chicanos, that we would still be in a bind, and in a much more fundamental one. Such uniform application of standards is not a solution to the Chicano situation simply because the assumption is that the Chicano is going to behave like an Anglo. There is still absolutely no room being given for cultural diversity -- for different ways of behaving, different ways of thinking, different ways of speaking, different ways of appearing, or whatever. Absolutely none. Anything of that kind would be considered as affecting detrimentally your job performance. This strikes me as being the fundamental problem. As to whether to solve that kind of problem you have to go to separate factories, separate bureaucracies, separate schools, and so on -- I'm not sure if that is the case. The idea of having parallel institutions is one kind of model. But it may be, on the other hand, that there are other kinds of models. You could still have within one institution things and situations structured to allow for cultural diversity among the people that work there. It may be that within one particular kind of whole system, say an industrial system, things might be structured in such a way that you allow for cultural diversity

In this manner acculturation does not become a built-in part of the whole process. Then the Chicano would not have to acculturate himself and assimilate in order to succeed in that kind of system. Now, is there only one industrial system that is possible, or would it be possible to construct different kinds of industrial systems that would make allowances for cultural diversity? It seems to me this is the kind of model we need to start developing. To my knowledge, no one is doing so.

Seña: Let me ask you Juan (Gomez), how you feel about whether it appears inevitable that pressures toward acculturation cannot be thwarted, given present systems.

Gomez: I'd like to direct myself to that question by speaking about how the bias of peer workers operates against the Chicano, even aside from how the employer may feel. This bias is often conscious and explicit, sometimes unconscious and implicit.

I'm thinking right now of a mining district that is still in operation, and where there is a single most powerful corporation. It was mestizos and Indians who discovered the mines and attempted to work them. Then came the period of the Mexican-American War, and the kind of displacement that occured; then conflict with the Indians. The Mexican title holders to the claims lost out, and Indian raids made it very difficult to continue mining operations. What happens is that the claims were picked up in some kind of market-bank deal by wild cat entrepreneurs -- I guess you would call them "scrub" entrepreneurs. This is about 1860 to 1870. These entrepreneurs consist of two Englishmen and an Irishman -- individuals undeniable possessing a lot of fortitude, and a certain amount of skills. They are faced with the problem of getting back their investments, and of initiating a large mining operation. So they go into the area, and the first thing that they must reckon with is that they are going to need workers, and workers who are talented, consistent, and loyal. At that time they could not secure any kind of worker but Mexican. So they set up through a Mexican American local store owner to recruit such workers. The store owner goes to the area of El Paso and communicates with the mining centers further south in Chihuahua. He recruits about twenty-five Chicano families. The people are brought up and immediately they are put to work. The situation is extremely risky because of the constant problems with the Apaches. The original work force is decimated almost, and then continuously replenished with new recruits. It is the Mexicans who must do the mine explorations, the wagon driving, and the like, all of which were skilled occupations. Also, because they traveled a lot, death was very common due to the usual frontier hazards. Very quickly a fairly sizable community developed in the mining locale. Soon there were around seventy-five families; there was a strictly Mexican operation except for the major entrepreneurs. After about ten or fifteen years have passed, things are far more stable generally throughout the region, and there is even other than Mexican talent available, but the mine owners were extremely pleased with the mining operation just as it was. During this time the Chicanos set up a religious association, built a church, recruited a priest, established a Comité Cívico. Also, at this time there was no sheriff but a committee of guardias was appointed by the Comité to keep order. Repeatedly documents tell how effectively all this was done.

Eventually, the company began to get pressure from the local Anglo townspeople who by this time had moved into the area, and from the ranchers of the region, concerning the compact Mexican community. Pressure was such that steps had to be taken to bring in American workers -- stewards, technicians, and so on -- for, prior to this time such jobs were all being done by Mexicans. Reluctantly the mine owners acceded. Over time, then, the Mexican workers were almost all forced out, first because of the Anglo community, pressures coming on the company from the outside, then by the presssure that was created by the new white workers and technicians, who objected to the large number of Mexicans, and particularly those in the supervisory position. So by around 1915, the general situation in and out of the mines was extremely violent. The entire community was in a state of lawlessness, because the internal social controls of the Mexicans had largely broken down because of their occupational displacement and discriminatory treatment by the Anglos. Most of the Mexicans were now only carriers, workers who carry the mined ore on their backs. The unions, now on the scene, argued that if they do organize, organization shall not apply to the Mexican workers. By 1915 there was what in effect were racial confrontations between on the one hand the Mexican workers, and on the other the Anglo workers -- most of them Irish and Welsh -- and the mine owners. The situation had become polarized. Eventually the Mexicans as a significant group were eliminated from the scene.

It is worth noting that around the 1920s that apparently Mexicans typically were scattered over a wide range of occupations, as in the mining district example, but that by the late 1930s and as unionization of American workers advanced, Mexican workers were displaced in the Southwest.

What I am offering is an historical example as regards the broad situation in which the Mexican worker finds himself. There is not only the employer attitude to consider, but also the peer situation, and the outside white community as well. Our problem is that we are not a compact labor force able to neutralize the kind of pressures I've spoken about. This situation sometimes makes for stress for the Chicano, and sometimes it is the peer element that most blocks his progress, and in effect creates problems for even more "benevolent" management. However, management wants only to lessen their own direct problems and maximize their profits.

Raigoza: I'd like to reinforce Juan's (Gomez) overall point but with another example to suggest a different kind of result of pressures from within and to some extent from without. Let's say we have a school teacher who is a Chicano at an elementary school. We can expect that she is one Chicano of a non-Chicano faculty of about fifty persons or so. Now, such institutions are controlled by Anglo administrators, who instead of trying to develop viable educational mechanisms to address the needs of Chicano students are more concerned with mechanisms by which to mold Chicano students after the Anglo image. Further, the Anglo viewpoint subscribes to the notion of the disadvantaged, deprived Chicano child, and the Anglo educator feels it more important to bring to that child social-recreational activities rather than deal with fundamentals of reading, writing and arithmetic. Repeatedly one encounters the situation of the Anglo teacher who uses classroom time to take the children to the museum of natural history, or to the beach. Presumably these kinds of activities are "expanding" the child's world. The Anglo teacher may say, I'm doing wonderful, and the Chicano kids may say, Miss So-and-So is so wonderful, she takes us all over. If education is limited to these activities, serious flaws exist. If we were to imquire about instruction in new math, an answer may go as follows: We know that disadvantaged, deprived can't understand what an intersect is at the grammer school level. Consequently such instruction is not imparted to Chicano children. To return to our Chicano teacher: how can she reverse these practices? The obstacles are considerable -- she must oppose fellow teachers, administrators, a board of education as well. Insofar as she is removed from the decision-making apparatus few changes can be expected.

Seña: I would like us now to direct our attention back to the idea of familia and the question of occupational opportunity, which was touched upon earlier. First, let me say what is obvious to us all as Chicanos: that familia translates as extended rather than merely nuclear family. The nuclear family concept is, of course, the household of parents and dependent children alone. The extended family for Chicanos is a relatively tight geographical collection of nuclear families along patrilinear lines of dominant social interaction.

Raigoza: It's my impression that the extended family is far more important to the Chicano family than it is for the Anglo family. I also think that the emphasis on extended families holds by social class among Chicanos. This emphasis translates as a cultural characteristic for Chicanos in that families are expressive oriented. For instance, if a member of a Chicano family gets into trouble and is sent to prison, I think he continues to be viewed as an integral member of the family. He isn't automatically rejected because of so-called "deviance." Now, how do feelings about the extended families get transferred into the occupational area? I think Chicanos tend to look at the "whole" person more so than do Anglos. I've heard of instances phrased to the effect that, well, I really like you -- you're a nice guy, and this has nothing to do with you personally, but I'm going to have to fire you from this job! It seems that this is an internally inconsistent statement. At any rate, I think a Chicano employer and worker undoubtedly take this action on very personal terms. Of course, this general subject requires empirical investigation to enable us to speak about it with more confidence. but I do feel Chicanos are more concerned with the whole person -- how he feels, and the extenuating circumstances that strongly influence the work situation and enters into the decision as whether to fire the man or not. I think Chicanos would be willing to allow greater latitude in such matters than the Anglo counterpart. Chicano family orientations enter and influence such matters because our training as members of extended families allows for greater sensitivit to the extenuating histories of family members.

Seña: If we are to accept the general idea of Chicanos being more expressive than instrumental, you (Raigoza) might elaborate further, just to make sure we are all dealing with the same idea, since several disciplines are represented amoung us here.

Raigoza: I'll return to the example of the family. A person is a member of the family by ascription. That is, by virtue of being born into a particular family he carries a particular status within the family that is not necessarily based on achievement. This status holds relatively constant regardless if the individual transcends the family's usual pattern of occupations. For example, I know of a Mexican American family wherein one of the sons achieved an unusually high occupational status. However, the son regularly visits his grandfather, who has always had a rather humble occupation, and he gives deference to the grandfather simply because he is the grandfather, senior patriarch of the family. In other words, both individuals assume their proper family roles despite the unusual hierarchy of rankings of prestige that occurs within the occupational sector alone. I seriously question if the same phenomenon holds true for Anglo families. I think Anglo family organization tends to follow lines of achievement. If a member of an Anglo family achieves higher occupational status than another member, does social distance increase accordingly?

Padilla: I'd like to pick up on the general theme. There is a growing body of psychological literature which suggests that if a person has someone to lean on, or a group like the extended family, or a number of good friends, that he can endure the psychological stresses of everyday life, and be much more successful generally, than the person who has just a nuclear family, or no friends, or only a small number of friends. Also, there is a growing belief among some psychologists that there are groups of people distributed throughout the world who because of this kind of solidarity of family life style can endure the stresses and are not so susceptible to suicide and other forms of mental illness. Some new literature coming out in the psychological area suggests that mental illness, contrary to popular belief, is not so great among Chicanos as once believed, and that they are a hell of a lot mentally healthier than previously believed. Now, if this is true, then what is suggested for employers is the harnessing of an understanding about our Chicano culture. If you want stable, secure workers, then perhaps reinforce those cultural beliefs rather than try to break them down, which has been the pattern until recently.

Seña: Are you suggesting then the hiring of as many members of the same family as possible?

Padilla: No, I'm not suggesting they do that, but what I am suggesting is that they should be in tune with culturally different people, in terms of the positive aspects of a culture, rather than focusing on the psychopathology of a culturally different group of people. Rather than stress an acculturation and assimilation of a people, they should accept a group of people as they are, with the built-in positive coping mechanisms that are in a group of people such as the Chicanos, and reinforce those.

Seña: It seems to me that the greatest contribution would be a destroying of a stereotype, or something near a stereotype. Generally, now it is known that the old idea of extended family and kinship relations as being dysfunctional in contemporary industrial society is not true, and that there has been a death of extended family and kinship relations for Anglo American population also has been found not to be true. The case is that these relations no longer follow classic lines, but have changed, but are still there. And in the case of Chicano population it seems to me that you are suggesting that if it's more widely recognized that the Chicano's propensity to think in extended family terms more so than other groups is not dysfunctional for him within the occupational structure. I'm not sure directly how not, but we are dealing with the general idea right here. What might we say to make the idea more concrete?

Lara: You could put it in one sentence: Is nepotism profitable for a firm? It might or might not be. From the point of view of a firm, the fact that the individuals know each other helps in a reduced labor turnover and reduces absenteeism and friction. But would they be better workers if they are members of the same family? I tend to believe that they would be better workers.

Padilla: I'm not suggesting that you want to hire the whole family, but what I am suggesting is that if a guy is a good worker, and such a good worker that you want to transfer him across the country, because it's going to be to his economic advantage to do so, not to mention of course to the advantage of the firm, and he doesn't want to go, then the employer should understand why. Maybe he doesn't want to go because his family has always lived in Riverside, for example, and he's a good worker here, but if he goes elsewhere, he might not be. This is what I'm suggesting: to build on this kind of a cultural model -- understanding it. Now, what happens if the guy refuses the promotion which is contingent upon moving to another part of the country? He's liable not ever to advance again. That cuts him off right there. I'm suggesting that he can probably advance right here, and be much more effective, a much better worker, when he feels comfortable. The feeling of comfort he feels may be tied into a whole lot of cultural values and attitudes, such as what the family means to him.

Barrera: How do you achieve that kind of understanding on the part of an employer?

Padilla: Let me make some attempts at answering that. I think that the Chicano has two choices, as we've alluded to before. He has a choice of maintaining his Chicano identity. I think first of all, that if he assumes he is going to become assimilated that he's kidding himself. It's just not going to happen. He may get all the education in the world, he may do everything he can to really assimilate and be part of the other group. It's not going to happen unless he doesn't look Chicano, and unless he changes his name. If the Anglo is in control of the situation -- which he is -- regardless of how much he wants to deny his Chicano identity, it's still going to be attributed to him. Therefore, he has the other alternative of maintaining a Chicano identity, and trying to get into the system and at the same time continuously trying to bombard the system in such a fashion as we're doing here, trying to sensitize the Anglo to his culture. I think it's a very slow process. And I'm not sure it's going to be a change that's going to be meaningful. But I don't see any other change or any other way of changing the system.

Raigoza: At the cultural level, we have of course the model of the Jewish community. Now, it seems to me that the Jewish community has stressed its ethnicity along positive lines, and this hasn't been a detriment to their professional upgrading. On the other hand, if we talk about it in terms of a practical level, it seems to me that it's one thing to appeal to the better intentions of the employer towards creating employment opportunities for Chicanos, and it's another thing to use legal apparatus to bring about these better opportunities. I know a worker in the film industry who was a lab technician in the same job for twenty-five years at a major studio here in Southern California. The supervisor of that film lab was a known alcoholic and apparently was a great financial loss to the company. They weren't making any profits on the film lab. The most logical person to be upgraded to this position of supervisor was the Mexican American worker. There was a good deal of resistance that had to be overcome before it was finally conceded that the Mexican American worker should be appointed to the supervisor position. But it wasn't until a law suit brought about by the F.E.P.C. that an agreement was made to bring about the change. It seems to me as Chicanos we have to continue to pursue this line rather than to deal with the prejudicial attitudes that the particular employer may harbor.

Seña: Let's see: there seems to be a common agreement that what we're dealing with is the repression of one group, however that repression is translated, because of some essential difference. We've pointed out instances of repression on a basis of racism--though I would prefer the term "ethnocentrism" which is what I really think we're talking about, when we talk about culture characteristics coming into conflict. An interesting question that I think we're also dealing with is that whether acculturation occuring invariably means assimilation as well. We do know that acculturation can occur, but that assimilation won't. But the overall question we're dealing with is something slightly different: is it possible to have assimilation in terms of fitting into the United States of America without the acculturation demanded? Moreover, in demanding such acculturation, is the situation really dealt with, that is, that some of our culture characteristics are attacked as negative or dysfunctional and not examined as perhaps positive within the occupational situation. Now, Yamil Lara mentioned two things that increase, in his terms, the expense or the investment that's required to deal with Chicanos. One of these is a second language (or a first language). I'd like us to talk on this: How might bilingualism be seen as contributing positively to the occupational situation?

Raigoza: Bilingualism will be exploited insofar as it meets the business interests of those entrepreneurs who control those institutions where bilingualism is exploitable. For example, all you have to do is go down Broadway in downtown Los Angeles, and everywhere you go are signs saying, "Se habla español," and all the sales personnel are bilingual. Similarly, if you go down to San Diego, right across the border, there's a Jack-in-the-Box food stand, which I assume is an American franchise, and there they accept Mexican pesos as well as American dollars. Once again, when it serves that kind of pecuniary gain it seems to me that these institutions are very viable. However, when we try to translate this into the classroom situation, once more Spanish becomes a detriment.

Padilla: I'd like to support Raigoza's position by way of illustration of something that happened while I was at the student union on our campus the other day. I was sitting at a table by myself and three Anglo students sat nearby. They were talking about what they were studying. One said he was studying Spanish, and another said that was good. How come? asked another. The answer was something like, "Well, as you know in California there are many jobs nowadays for bilinguals." I think this is the attitude, a force of growing economic concern for bilingualism, but not for cultural reasons of understanding, or as regards the cultural aspects of what bilingualism implies.

Raigoza: I would argue as well that there will be Anglos who will emerge as the professionals in bilingualism! And not because it is a mechanism by which Chicanos can promote culture, but rather as an arena by which vocations and jobs and careers for non-Chicanos can be sustained.

Padilla: Additionally, one of the things that came out in a recent evaluation that we made following our "introduction to Chicano Studies" course at U.C. Santa Barbara resulted from a question we asked each student, why was he taking the course? The class, by the way, consisted of about fifty percent Anglo students. The response we noted from several Anglos was that, well, Chicanos are beginning to be people to be recognized in California, and for us to have a couple of courses in Chicano culture is going to facilitate our getting a job as teachers, social workers, or sociologists, or something else.

Seña: But doesn't the taking of such courses make the Chicano more effective?

Padilla: My guess is that it does not since I am afraid that the experts will still come from the Anglo culture group.

Raigoza: After all, who controls the schools of education? Chicanos? No.

Seña: Let me ask this: Aside from setting up parallel structures, as Barrera suggested was one possibility, and aside from making radical changes in the present institutions, what changes might be made within the given institutional structures so that Chicanos do not lose cultural identity?

Barrera: Community control of the schools.

Seña: Would this lower the expense of training the Chicano child in terms of the total picture of investment within the area of occupational opportunities? I ask this because it was one of Lara's points.

Gomez: In the sense that the expense would be picked up by the schools, yes. I think that if you look at the demands made by the student movement during the past six years, you see the demand for technical training and industrial preparation, and so on, in just about every situation. I think that if you had Chicano parents and young adults having a larger voice in school districts, immediately you would have a huge improvement in the kind of training put out by the schools. Because it is for their self interest -- that is, the self interest of their kids. In the situation you have now, the skills and the industrial training that there is, as we all know, is dated and pathetic in quality and extent. It does not prepare the majority of the students for anything but to be dishwashers and carwashers, despite the fancy names some of these shop courses might have. Chicano control of their schools would make a difference. I guess community control would be to the long term advantage of the employer, then, since coming out of the schools would be a person with some usable skills.

Seña: Does community control of schools then logically extend to vocational schools as well, and perhaps too to occupational training programs?

Gomez: If just for the reasons I spoke of, yes. There are other reasons.

Lara: Let me make this point. The educational needs of Chicanos have not been recognized by the Anglo community, so the Anglo community seems to provide programs that have been tailored for Anglos. If there is community control of schools, then hopefully there will be recognition of specific Chicano needs in terms of programs which are tailored for Chicanos at the primary and secondary levels of education. Now, the problem is this: control of the schools is a necessary but not sufficient condition. That is, it is necessary for Chicanos to get control of their schools, but what is also necessary is for the communities to raise enough money to be able to provide its schools not only with the same amount of training as the Anglo, but a higher expenditure per pupil than is going to be spent in the Anglo community. I have to keep coming back to this fact simply because any special program, any program that is which is out of the norm, is by definition more expensive. And that is one of the problems that the Chicano community faces, for even if it does obtain the control of schoolboards, it still needs additional funds.

Seña: Additional monies aside, Lara, what sort of changes would occur if a manpower training program which was totally Chicano community controlled did happen?

Lara: The program would be more directly relevant to the Chicano community. The training programs, that have been developed are essentially training programs which are aimed at the unemployed Anglo worker. The blacks made the demands that there are black needs. Well, there are black needs, and we can accept that there can be educational approaches that are essentially black-oriented approaches, then the Chicano with the problem of bilingualism or, the asset of bilingualism has a more easily defined set of Chicano approaches to any type of training than other groups.

Let me deal briefly with skills. You have in the Chicano community people who are totally out of the economic system. They cannot communicate well in either language, unfortunately. They have little or no training. And any of the training programs which are aimed at hard-core unemployed of the general society will not reach these Chicanos at all. For such Chicanos, you have to deal with the bilingual problems that they have, and then in addition to that you have to provide him with direct skills training. Such Chicanos are what you would call a truly hard-core-unemployed group. You have to develop some way of bringing these individuals back into, or simply into, the economic system.

Seña: Let's see. In terms of a community recognizing these needs, for instance in terms of manpower programs, then a first level is accommodating those who don't even have sufficient reading skills to read minimal directions for performing even minimal jobs. Is that the idea?

Lara: You're talking about individuals in the community who have third or fourth grade education. They're functional illiterates. Any blue collar employment requires reading. It requires an ability to follow instructions, an ability to work independently. These abilities are the result of some basic education which these individuals don't have, especially some Chicanos in parts of Texas, where the average level of education is as low as three years. So the Chicano is about two years behind the black in California, I think about four years behind the black in Texas. This extremely low educational level presents a very unique problem for the Chicano community. Most manpower problems do not recognize this type of problem.

Raigoza: I think Lara is right when he says that community control of the schools is a necessary but not sufficient condition. I'm reminded of the situation in Crystal City, Texas where Chicanos who were elected to become city councilmen only to find out they inherited a bankrupt administration. How can you run citywide programs on bankruptcy? Clearly the Anglos spent the resources to ensure structured failure. The same thing can happen with control of other institutions that Anglos may relinquish, but will not provide enough social logistical support to ensure its success. Finally, we may well ask, will there always be a surplus of unskilled, "functionally illiterate" Mexican American persons who will always constitute a labor force that can be exploited? At least I must raise this as a question if not a conclusion.

Sena: I might mention, perhaps in order to expand on your example, that I had occasion last week to talk with a man from Crystal City. He mentioned, "All right, we got control of the town, and not only the town but the county as well, but with no one with the skills to run a town or county." I think this point is on top of the matter of inheriting a bankrupt situation, even literally a bankrupt one. So I'm thinking that part of community control must be concern not only for education in blue-collar areas, but on up.

Lara: This relates back to the funding sources of most school districts. The funding source is mostly local, and unfortunately Chicanos tend to live in areas which, comparatively speaking, are poorer than other areas of the city. So that the funding that is provided for the schools for Chicanos is lower than that provided for other areas of the city. We have to break away from local funding of local schools, if we are to break a very vicious cycle.

Barrera: What about the problems of centralized control that go against the idea of community control? It's a matter of who controls the funds, wanting to control what the funds are spent for, and the institutions the funds are spent on.

Lara: I don't want control to be centralized. The choice doesn't necessarily have to be one or the other. For instance, one model would be where you have equal expenditure by district, and the state as a whole being taxed, and so equal expenditure occurs while at the same time local control of the educational institution is retained.

Barrera: Creating a model like that is one thing, getting it to work is another. "Community control of the schools" can be just a slogan. But what does it really mean to take community control of the schools if the funding source is coming from outside? For instance, teacher accreditation is done by a state agency, federal funds come from Washington, and the curriculum is prepared somewhere else. Now, where is community control? There is no real change possible in such a situation. Now, when you move in the direction of what community control should mean, then you are dealing in the area of recognizing that in terms of dealing as part of a larger system, that fundamental changes cannot be made unless the entire system changes.

Seña: We are approaching closing time for our discussion. Does anyone wish to add anything we may not have covered as regards our discussion title?

Lara: There is one point about the inability of the Chicano to defer gratification towards greater long term rewards. Some people consider this inability as a cultural characteristic of the Chicano. Now, from one point of view, such denial of deferral of gratification on the part of the Chicano is a very rational position. If he can see that the position or salary that will be the outcome of, say, his college investment will not match that of the same investment of the Anglo, then he is less willing to make this investment. The same circumstance can face the individual Chicano with respect to a training or economic institution. But the push for Chicano factories has to be viewed from the perspective that they may be more expensive from one point of view, but they are far more beneficial to the Chicano community than let's say having the Chicano workers go outside their community to obtain similar employment. The only problem with the Chicano factory is that they probably are not as profitable as a regular factory. I mean, that essentially it would bear a higher cost, and the government would have to provide substantial subsidies.

Seña: As so too the government would have to bear the parallel deficits of say the Chicano grammer school.

Lara: Well, the instance of the Chicano grammer school, for instance, is not that clear-cut because you see, when you are dealing with public enterprises the profit-loss approach is not as useful, as when you are dealing with specific commercial enterprises. Oh yes, we're still dealing with investment in the future, but it's much easier to get the government to fund educational programs than for the government to finance a mattress factory out in East Los Angeles. For a mattress factory in East Los Angeles, run by Chicanos, will probably produce mattresses at a higher cost than a mattress factory say in West Los Angeles.

Padilla: I'm not clear about your point about the Chicano factory. Are you talking about a Chicano factory that's completely Chicano run, operated, and financed, or a Chicano factory run and operated but not financed by Chicanos?

Lara: My point is that Chicanos do not have the capital to finance such a program. If the Chicano feels that at the end of the training program he may not obtain employment, or that if he does it will be at a lower salary, then he may not participate in a training program, simply because it may not pay for him while it does for the Anglo, or does not pay as much as it does for the Anglo. So, in personal terms, too, the investment the Chicano makes is riskier and will probably results in a lower return for the investment than for the Anglo. So a Chicano's decision is rational if viewed from this perspective. Another point I want to deal with concerns the idea of Chicano control of economic institutions. Say, for instance a Chicano factory. A Chicano factory would pay off for the community, and for the Chicano community specifically, but would cost society at large much more than an average factory. Chicano factories would probably run much higher costs in terms of dollars and cents than an Anglo factory. Lack of experience, lack of expertise, lack of training, working in an underdeveloped area resulting in much higher insurance costs -- these are the higher costs. But such a factory would have benefits for the Chicano community in this respect: Even though let's say they are more expensive than the normal factory, than the usual enterprise, it would have benefits for the Chicano community in that Chicano entrepreneurial talent would be developed, Chicano managers would be developed, Chicanos would be able to obtain employment adjacent to their homes, and would also be able to obtain additional experience. So as a training facility and also as a center around which other factories can be built -- since other factories or economic institutions will tend to be attracted by a first factory

factory, and if they did have the capital, they probably wouldn't establish a factory in East Los Angeles to begin with. Because if a Chicano has capital he will directly try to get the best return on his money, he will probably try to locate outside the barrio. For the barrio presents higher costs to any factory or to practically any enterprise than the same factory elsewhere in the city. You're dealing with higher insurance costs, higher absenteeism, higher turnover.

Padilla: But it looks as if you yourself are now dealing with the same stereotypes that the Anglo employer is dealing with. For instance, that you're going to have a higher turnover. Remember that I pointed out that this isn't true?

Lara: Actually, you don't even have to introduce the word "Chicano." So long as you introduce "lower levels of income" or "lower levels of education," then that is sufficient. In terms of what has been done, in terms of commercial enterprise costs, enterprises which have been established in the Chicano and black communities with government assistance have traditionally incurred much higher costs. We're dealing with entrepreneurial talent: how do you develop entrepreneurial talent but through experience and through availability of capital? If Chicanos have not had the opportunity to run their own businesses, they are going to undergo a period in which they are going to make mistakes. They are going to make some wrong decisions. It's a learning process. But these kinds of mistakes are costly. So you have a choice of either hiring an Anglo manager who has had fifty years experience of let's say handling a mattress factory vis-a-vis hiring a Chicano who has never run a mattress factory because he has never had the opportunity. You are going to have higher costs. So it's not dealing with stereotypes, *it's dealing with levels of experience, levels of training, and so on.*

Seña: *Carnáles*, our time is up, we must end the session. *Muchísimas grácias.*

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE ON CULTURAL LINGUISTIC VARIABLES IN MANPOWER VOCATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAMS

Skyline Inn, Washington, D.C.
May 31-June 1, 1973

(The following is a transcription of tapes recorded at the Conference. It has been edited to eliminate unnecessary duplication and other problems that are intrinsic in spoken English. In some instances, it was impossible to specifically identify the speaker. In such instances, generic identification has been used.)

Leroy Walser: At the beginning of this morning's meeting, let me give a little of the history of this project. Some two and a half or three years ago, there were several individuals in the [U.S.] Office of Education who were concerned about the quality of the educational experience that was taking place in the training and retraining of individuals who were to be included into the labor market through either the Division of Manpower Development and Training-sponsored activities or other vocational activities. One area was a tremendous deficit, it seemed: the construction of the curriculum materials or the construction of the teaching process, the way that it was handled to equate or to include some of the culture or the language problems that were in evidence to make sure the learning experience was the most efficient and most advantageous possible. There was not much agreement on what constituted cultural differences or distinctions or language differences or distinctions that would act either as a hindrance if it were approached in one way or [as] an advantage if it were approached in another way.

We didn't believe that the educational process or educational development had reached its status of nonprogress. We believe that as long as there are human beings, there will be progress in some way or another. We wanted to have an idea of how we could improve the delivery system nationwide in manpower training -- vocational training -- that would pay a little more close attention to the specific and distinct differences that were found in different population groups in the United States of America.

We were not interested in trying to discover which came first, the chicken or the egg; in this situation, we were trying to discover, or our intent was to try to discover, what things could be changed to make education and training in the manpower and the vocational areas more relevant to the trainee or to the learner -- the student -- and to his aspirations in securing employment. Now if there were changes that needed to be made, we wanted to hear about them and to give some recommendations that we think could be taken into consideration.

So we wanted to preoccupy ourselves with the educational relevance and the affinity for the culture or the affinity for the language in making that experience more directly important to the black, the Spanish-speaking, the native American, the Appalachian white, and other population groups that were found and that had wanted to have themselves included in the learning experiences. So with that kind of background, we went to the Office of Special Concerns that is in the U.S. Office of Education which was headed up at that time by Dick Hayes, in which office are located several offices, three of which are the offices for Spanish-speaking American Affairs, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the Office of Afro-American Affairs. The structure began to evolve on how to proceed with this study. With the cooperation of a broad group of people within the U.S. Office of Education and the cooperation of several individuals outside the U.S. Office of Education, the project began to formulate itself and it's to the point that it has reached now. I would like again to welcome you here and to expect a day and a half of real honest interchange, so that the interchange here can be included into the total report that will be the final report from this project. Included in there are the recommendations of how to deal with the findings. Preliminary to that whether or not you people agree or disagree with the findings, what the nature of your agreement or disagreement is, how could your recommendations make the findings (if you find them valid) more clearly understandable by those people who are in charge or responsible for developing the curriculum and the educational practices in manpower development and training and other activities in the vocational area. We welcome you here and hope you enjoy Washington, too.

Garth Mangum: I represent the contractor, Olympus Research Corporation. Because of our background in policy manpower training and vocational education we were asked to put together the team of people who did the actual work on this project. The intent was to determine to what extent cultural and linguistic variables might impede people's ability to profit from manpower and vocational skills training. We are not experts in culture or language. To determine what cultural and linguistic attributes exist, and to what extent they impede manpower training, we pulled together a team of people who were both knowledgeable in this area and [who] were drawn from the particular minority groups to be studied. Luvert Simpkins was primarily responsible for that part of the study and the report related to blacks. For native Americans, we began the project with Mrs. Shirley Sells, a Navajo Indian anthropologist, and completed it with Kathy McKee, whose background and origin is the tribes of upstate New York. Asterio Ano-Bajo, who is unable to be with us at this conference, was primarily responsible for the work related to chicanos. We recognize that in concentrating on the chicano population, we left out a lot of other Spanish-speaking people. For that reason, we particularly requested other Spanish-speaking groups to be at this meeting so that we can get some perceptions of the extent to which those considerations related to chicanos may or may not be relevant to Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Latin-American immigrants and other Spanish-speaking.

A long time ago, Thayne Robson and I were trained in this business by a Harvard professor, now dead, who used to say "If you want to know something, go find somebody who already knows it and ask him." That is what we commenced to do. You will find in the back of the report, if you have gone through it, some materials related to the methodology. The first thing that the staff did was to dig into the literature in the field -- as far as culture, language and training, education related to the various groups that we were concerned with -- to see what people had already said on the subject and see if they could distill from all of that literature, if not a consensus, at least a relatively solid hypothesis about what had been discovered relative to those questions.

Then they prepared a series of questionnaires closely related but directed to the particular groups involved and then went about the country to people who were engaged in manpower training, in settings where there were large concentrations of the racial and ethnic groups that were involved in the study. At those sights they interviewed both the administrators and instructors who were teaching the people, and the enrollees who were drawn from the ethnic and racial groups involved. They then tried to separate those perceptions, for instance among the administrators and the instructors, between those who were of the dominant Anglo majority and those who came from the ethnic and racial minorities to see if there was a difference between the way an instructor who happened also to be a native American might perceive the teaching of, say, Navajos or someone who is an Anglo in the same kind of a setting.

Then in addition to the survey of the literature, the questionnaires, and the interviews all over the country, there were two symposia held. One on the West Coast, pulled together a group of chicano scholars, and you will find in the report the transcript of recordings of that meeting. Another meeting was held here in Washington, D.C., sponsored by Howard University, which tested the tentative findings by submitting them to a group of black scholars. All of those three sources of information were then distilled by Luvert, Kathy, Asterio, into reports concerning each of the racial-ethnic groups involved. Then that whole thing was distilled by other members of the staff into the report as you have it here.

Despite our having done a lot of work and pulled together some useful information, we feel that this now needs to be reviewed by people like yourselves, most of whom are in one way or another on the firing line of manpower training and vocational education for the particular groups involved. We seek your perceptions about what we think we've found in all of these materials and sources that we have just enumerated to you. Then we ask two questions: (1) Is it true? That is, from your perceptions and your experience, do you agree or disagree, or have some modifications of the findings we have here. And (2), how useful is it? It is not enough to simply be the truth. The whole purpose for the Office of Education is to come up with something that might be useful in helping them to advise educators and trainers throughout the country as to how they might go about the business of manpower training and vocational education, relating to groups with multiple backgrounds of culture and language.

The purpose of this meeting today is to maximize your input and our listening. We will review with you this morning what we think are the findings and recommendations and then we will turn to you for your suggestions and comments and hope that in a day and a half of intensive discussion we can get from you insights that will help us then to finalize the documents and make it useful to the U.S. Office of Education.

Joe Canchola: The linguistic variable does interfere with the learning process. It is a distinct characteristic of the language and the barrio that does interfere with the learning process. I live in a barrio right now and I have for 37 years, except to go to school and come back home at night. I know some kids in the same neighborhood who don't do well in school because they have to live and perform in two different worlds. They speak English in school. As soon as they are back across the creek, they take their shoes off and start playing and speaking Mexican. They really don't like the Anglo society to come across the track and play with them because they know that they are there to see the oddities -- what they look like, which is cut levis, barefooted, nose unwiped. They are making fun of them. That alone creates a stigma, a mental barrier to the learning process. The barrio itself is a cultural characteristic.

Edward Casavantes: I agree with your conclusions. I don't know how in the hell you arrived at them because I reviewed the literature, and with one exception, one brilliant paper written by me, your review of the literature is weak. How you ever arrived at the right conclusion with reviewing the wrong literature I will never know. But what this man is saying is actually something that you have said in a different way. Being chicano doesn't hurt you, being looked down on as a chicano hurts you, and this permeates the entire structure. This is what we learned at the Commission on Civil Rights. Being black doesn't hurt you.

By reviewing the Coleman study data, we found out that the achievement quotients in school for the blacks is irrelevant to being black. In most of the correlates the distortions were due to socioeconomic factors. Interestingly enough, some blacks on the Commission of Civil Rights said "That is impossible, being black has hurt us a lot. Therefore, this idiot Coleman didn't know what he was talking about." So they ran a special analysis and came up with a tiny bit of what we call the variance which was due to being black. They were very unhappy because they were convinced being black is very damaging. The answer is nonsense, being black is not damaging at all, given proper schools and given quality education. Being looked down upon and being excluded from jobs -- that is what hurts.

What you are saying is that the neurological capacity to learn, of chicanos or blacks or native Americans, is unimpaired. Regardless of the fact that there is no native difference in capacity to learn, there may be some differences in cognitive style. We need a massive study about cognitive style. You say that even though we have equal capacity to learn, the life-style or the culture may be different. You don't say what it is.

A shortcoming of your study is that you should have taken enough time and trouble concerning your initial findings to find out what are the cultural variables. I wish you luck, I have been hunting for them for the past four or five years, and I have not found any definitive statements of exactly how these things work. We talk about machismo, for instance, but machismo is a very broadly conceived thing.

A colleague of mine wrote a conceptual paper talking about four kinds of machismo, some healthy, some not. There is a related female phenomenon: the idea of the Virgin Mary, the patron saint of Mexico, who was alleged to have certain feminine, so-soft, gentle, passive qualities which the woman assumes as the balancing mechanism for the machismo of the male. I defy you to start teaching your teacher corps, your Job Corps people, how to teach chicanos, without knowing the substantive content of what these things are.

Reva Crawford: The way you have posed the question, the only obstacle there could be to training was if you had a group that had substandard intelligence. That's true in a way. But in the traditional educational setting, there are cultural aspects that can be obstacles. If you know that a group is teachable, then all you have to do is find the right method to teach. Then you have to make changes that would be effective for this particular group and in their ways of receiving things, which, I think, is one of the things you were touching on. But to me, this is kind of missing the question. You keep saying it is not so much the cultural differences that these groups have as it is the instructors' perception and whether they deal with these characteristics.

But if we talk about traditional education, then these cultural and linguistic factors are barriers. If you have instructors who have an understanding of the people they are teaching and who have a very urgent desire to get across to them things that they think these people need, and try and be understanding, then they are going to teach. You can give a good teacher any old blackboard and chalk and he can teach, and you can give a poor teacher any amount of materials in the world and [he is] not going to teach. So staff selection is much more important than the materials. That is not saying that the materials shouldn't be developed or that there isn't a scarcity of materials for people in these situations.

However, think of this problem. How many Indian tribes do you have? Are you going to develop separate materials for every Indian tribe in the United States, for every language? That is not feasible. Perhaps for the chicanos from low socioeconomic status, people that don't read and write English probably don't read and write Spanish either.

Most people think of individualized instruction as using machines. A lot of people from universities will tell you that it is an advantage to adults to give them a lot of audio-visual materials. The truth of the matter is that most of them don't like machine learning because it doesn't have the charisma of a good teacher. It doesn't provide the pride or incentive in learning. Particularly among the older Indian adults, you find that machines are a complete null.

Ken Duffin: I wouldn't be culturally deprived if I was not black. I start out by being handled as culturally deprived in the inner cities. I think that everybody could have made it had everybody been handled equally. But I immediately have some cultural barriers from the first grade on, I have some cultural barriers with the same people, the administrator, the counselor, and the teacher. If I am taught you can go into vocational school because your family can't afford for you to go to college, I feel a cultural barrier.

Mario Molins: The Spanish-speaking have just been discovered in Miami as of last year. Columbus just landed last year in Miami. There are some large institutions that are traditional, that are supposed to be taking care of the manpower needs of all of the citizens of Dade County. By and large, they have left out minorities. We have just succeeded last year in bringing in other manpower programs that will incorporate the rest of the population that is not being served by the more traditional institutions. Basically, they operate on the same basis, they have the same kinds of staff patterns, but it is the attitude that makes the difference. When you have people that really take time out to see what the trainee needs in counseling and then doing follow-up, that makes the whole difference. If the trainers don't recognize the very needs of the trainees there is definitely a problem. Also if the trainees feel that they are going through a program that is really not theirs on which they have no input in the planning stages, it is just the perceptions of others being imposed upon them. The institutions say, "Now you are going to be just like us after you have finished there, and you will be beautiful just like we are." If the trainee doesn't feel that he has the chance to really have input into the curricula and the plan that goes into the program, he is going to feel that he is really not going to get anything out of it.

Casavantes: As various people talk it dawned on me that one of the things that is missing is that we are being studied, we blacks are being studied, we native Americans are being studied, we Mexican-Americans are being studied, so that the Anglo can find out what our cultural attributes are so that he can best deal with us. It seems to me that one of the most extraordinary omissions is that the Anglo has not studied himself. I submit to you that 95 percent of Americans, white Anglo-Saxons, middle-class types, could not give a lecture on what constitutes being white, middle-class, Anglo-Saxon. In other words, what are our value systems as Anglos that we could contrast as being chicano, being native American? Therefore, this is a blind spot. You must teach Anglo instructors who they are, and teach them that their values like all cultural values are artificial. By artificial I do not mean that they are not valid. I for one will not belittle the Anglo culture because there are no values to a culture. All cultures have values. All cultures have survival values. They have desirability within the context of what is happening. Anglos don't even begin to realize, for example, that individual competitiveness is not God's word. In some Indian tribes, competitiveness is frowned upon, for example, and to them it's God's word too.

Duffin: In our programs we are all predominantly black in black areas. So I'm not just worried about a white administrator, or a white counselor, or a white teacher. I am as concerned about black administrators, and black counselors, and black teachers doing the same things. I am concerned, basically, that administrators don't know how to "administrate," in some cases. Some teachers don't necessarily know how to teach, and counselors don't know how to counsel.

Casavantes: We have some empirical data from the Mexican-American education study. I am sorry to report that chicano teachers were a little harder on chicano students than were Anglo teachers.

Ella M. Griffin: Though some of these obstacles you call cultural traits may be caused by poverty, you have to decide why that person is poor. The reason that a white person is poor and the reason that a black person is poor may be entirely different reasons, and it is the reasons that that person is poor which can be cultural.

Molins: The bulk of the Cubans having arrived within the last ten to twelve years in the greater Miami area have not experienced, historically, the kind of miniculture or subculture, or the fact that they have not identified themselves as being a minority. They come without any "hang-ups" about being a minority. They are very much secure in one way and not in others because they don't live where they came from anymore. They came very secure, very implanted in their beliefs, and they have no qualms about letting anybody know about it, and so the dominant group in Dade County hasn't come to terms with that. They want to look at Cubans like any other minority, and Cubans will not allow themselves to be looked down upon. At least at this time. My concern is that in the future if we don't take care that the positive pride in their culture remains, they may finally wind up being put down as minorities with all the negative connotations.

Griffin: Don't you think the reason for that attitude is that there have been so many more professional people come from Cuba than most of the other groups you have interviewed?

Molins: No. The bulk of the Cubans, contrary to common misunderstanding, have come after 1965 and are not professionals. The rounded figures are something like 65 to 70 percent of the Cubans who have never graduated from high school. . . those in Miami.

Canchola: I don't want to leave here thinking that I am harder on my kids in my classroom. I might have had a reason for doing that because of all the things that I went through.

The few teachers that managed to get through had to become so "Anglicized" that they internalized the values of the Anglo which looked down on the chicano. These teachers in turn became harder on the chicano because they said "You have got to be like me. Look, I made it through and you have got to make it through, and if you don't have great aspirations then you must be inferior." I am exaggerating a point. But the point is that you are talking about a different generation. You and I, we had to go through a very traditional school to get through graduate school. If you weren't very traditional, you didn't get through. If you didn't assimilate traditional values, you didn't get through. You just dropped out. Then they evidently feel that these traditional values must be the good values.

He's fighting the whole system and makes sure that the kid that comes into the room is very proud of the fact that he is a Mexican. Sometimes the young teacher becomes harder because he wants that kid to know that it is not bad being a Mexican or speaking Spanish, like for many years you and I were told that it was terrible. You're hard on the student but for a very affirmative reason. I have seen blacks being very hard on blacks, "You're going to make it better than the whites because you are black." The kid responds, thinking you expect more from him. Then the kid says something like this, "Hey man, it's cool."

Thayne Robson: I wonder if it wouldn't be helpful at this point in the discussion, judging from your comments, to alter a little bit the agenda here and maybe move into a discussion of particular groups.

Kathy McKee: The process of delivering any educational service is a very complex one, and it presumes that whoever delivers it understands that while the student has to interact with him, he has to interact with the student. Many of the people we interviewed in these centers had very set attitudes such as, "The thing that makes an Indian an Indian is that Indians make bows and arrows and hunt buffalo." There are no more buffalo. Indians don't make bows and arrows anymore. Therefore, there are no longer any more Indians.

Many people said "Well, my parents came to this country as immigrants and if they could make it, why can't native Americans make it? Why don't Indians make it? These people just aren't trying." These centers were run on a contractual relationship. "You're here for a service to be provided, we are here to provide the service. The objective of this program is to bring you in for a processing session whereby regardless of cosmetics, regardless of language background, by the time you get out you will be a certified pseudo-Anglo." People would say, "I am sorry but Indians cannot remain Indians if they want to participate in the economy of this country."

The results were devastating. Indians were exported or deported to training programs hundreds of miles away from the reservation, hundreds of miles away from the community where they lived. Statistics had shown that many of these Indians would return to the reservations, would not use the types of training they had received. But in spite of this, Indians continued to be sent away or continued to be trained for occupations that would have to be practiced in urban areas, they could not be practiced on the reservation. Students were taken into programs when they had a reading level in English of second or third grade, who, without extensive remediation, could not have passed the GED examination. Moreover, they could not handle straight English from instructional materials.

Very few centers which provided manpower training for American Indians, in fact, were staffed or had even one American Indian on the staff. Where there were Indians present in the facilities they found themselves being drained bone dry by people who expected them to participate in encounter groups where they broke themselves down and provided item analysis of what American Indians were about.

People would admit to me that "I don't really know how to deal with Indians, therefore, when a student does not show up for five sessions, I am going to put it down on his little time card that he did because I don't want to have a conflict with him about the fact that he missed five sessions." It wasn't, "Well, maybe I should sit down with him and find out if there is a reason why he is not coming"; and it wasn't, "Well, maybe at some point we must impose discipline on a system." Maybe your respect for a person is reflected in the fact that you go to him and say, "Look, you are an adult; you have missed three sessions so perhaps I have done something to offend you or perhaps the program is not filling your needs.

But I have to be realistic, I have to tell you there is no way in the world that I can allow you to get out of this program if you do not attend all the training sessions, if you do not pass your X, Y, and Z skills."

The result is that in many training programs for many Indians who are in the thirty or forty age bracket, they participate in a manpower training program as a form of employment. They go through a program, get the stipend for each week, are out of work for maybe one or two months before the training cycle starts again, then enroll in another program. One student told me that he had been in four different training programs. If he didn't actually achieve vocational placement by the end of this one, he had had it, he simply was not going to go back to be put in X number of months of training and go out and find that he could not get into the job market anyway.

I know that's impressionistic, but these were very intuitive things that started rising to the surface and some of the questions are very deep ones. Do you train a person for independence by a totally dependent program? If you keep a person dependent all his life, and you assume the responsibility for making all the decisions for him, and you do deny him the opportunity to provide input, at what point in his life does he become a decision-making, independent, autonomous adult? Do you give him a pill at the end of the program that says "ZAP! You are an instant, independent Indian!" There are certain attitudinal training things which were very much absent in the program, and one of the responses of the students was to clock their time, to get through it if it was bearable. And in some cases it was made bearable by the fact that it was a residential program; therefore they had room, board, and a cash stipend for their families -- and they make the best of a bad situation.

Robson: I wonder, before you open it up for discussion, Kathy, if you wouldn't like to comment on what you came up with in the research, report on some of the items that were mentioned earlier like language and verbal communication, competition, illness, reaction to criticism, some of those things that were treated in the report as being of special significance in the native American case.

McKee: Within certain communities, certain of the members do, in fact, retain strong ties to tribal traditions. Programs tend to ignore this. You may take off Christmas and Easter but you may not go home for an important festival. You can tell a student you will expel him from the program. You can tell him you will dock his stipend, but the fact reamins that if it is important to him, he will go whether or not you grant him the permission.

Language is a very, very difficult thing to get at. One of the problems that I found was that some training centers used a child's basal reader as a means of teaching adults the basic reading skills. One male instructor told me he was teaching a group of adults. One individual began to read, "See Dick. See Jane. Silly. God damn!" and slammed the book shut and refused to read anymore. The rest of the class followed.

Casavantes: A smart man in California who had sixteen-year-old and fifteen-year-old kids who were lousy readers said to himself, "Why are these kids not interested in this?" His answer was very simple: "Broads and hot rods." He said, "Well, I am not going to teach them about sex because they probably know more about it than I do." He got the official California drivers manual. He said, "Do you want to learn how to drive?" They said, "Yeah, man." "Then you got to learn to read."

Do you know what those guys did? They learned to read because the subject was inherently interesting.

McKee: Language has built-in perceptions within it. There are things you say in Romance languages that you don't say in the same way in English. There are ways to perceive the world in Indian languages that don't necessarily coincide with the world view that the English language imposes on individuals. You can't ignore that in delivering services to students. One of the things that it involves is becoming very sensitized to your students and being able to do informal assessments on what they have and where they can go. In some instances there was definite linguistic interference. One training center complained that while the Navajo trainees could be trained to a very high level of competence in office skills, when using a dictaphone and listening to spoken dictation, they consistently omitted verb tense.

Griffin: May I interject a quick thing here, Kathy. I was on the Navajo Reservation once, a year or two ago, and we were talking about curriculum, etc., for training for teachers and also for children. So I was around the reservation during the day with a lot of people, and this was very interesting; but that night I attended a meeting on the Navajo community education concept. It was all [spoken] in Navajo. Somebody was translating rapidly in my ear, and every single important point that we had covered during the day with reference to the basic issues, everyone of those points was covered in Navajo . . . whereas people tend to think these days in terms of PERT charts; you know, those little boxes and all of this. The person who was talking to this point in Navajo made an outline on the blackboard. It was a stock of corn, and he was talking about the growth of the children -- bringing them to a point of fruition, don't you see. Then the leaves on the stock of corn were the thing. Now if Indian people had been involved in designing things of this sort, you wouldn't have this foolish PERT chart. Despite having everything printed out all nicely, people were falling to sleep in the day meeting. It was boring. But if you had the Navajos or any other Indian group express it in terms of their ideology, etc., it becomes lively.

Ed Hailes: Could I ask a question? If education was and is a barrier, does that mean that Indians will not move into the inner city based simply on educational lack of skills? I have the impression that the education caused them to stay "rural." Am I correct in that?

McKee: In the process of the field work I had occasion to talk to many Indians employed on a professional level, and the commitments that they had to the reservation were very deep-rooted, moral, ethical commitments. White people hear about the reservation, and they tend to think of a John Wayne movie. Let's face it, poverty is a reality on the reservation. But there are things there that have significance to Indian people that non-Indians cannot see or understand. One of the things that deeply disturbs many of the young people who work on an intern basis coming into Washington, when they go back to the reservation, is what has been brought on the reservation in their absence under the guise of progress, like, "We will get you involved in economic enterprises because a nine-to-five day purges the soul of all present and future sins"? They are very disturbed at having to keep everything under lock and key, and Indians stealing from one another. They don't regard the reservation as totally negative, and perhaps that's part of the problem.

It's like the problem that a lot of minority students run into when they get scholarships to big universities. Maybe its a quality educational institution. You are surrounded by people who are not from your community, who implicitly or explicitly hate you, and so it's an uphill push every step of the way to do what you know you have to do to get out of there with a degree. So Indians are transported to urban places. If they go to California, they sure don't give them homes in Beverly Hills, etc. They become a part of a form of architecture and life-style that you could call neo-ghetto. They are strange to the people who are original ghetto residents. They are not accepted. There may be people from different tribes there and they have to build up a whole new set of relationships. They are shut out of whatever is going on around them.

Everybody presumes, "Well, this person knows how to ride a bus; this person knows how to drive a car; this person knows that he has to make three transfers to get downtown to see the BIA official." And they don't! They don't know how to drive! If you have had any experience with the D.C. transit, you know that the worst thing in the world is to ask a bus driver a question. That's like taking your life into your own hands. So people are thrown into a completely negative situation and the counseling facilities are not there to help them cope. When you get right down to it, it may be a pace of life that within a pragmatic frame of reference just does not have that much value.

So you work from nine to five, so you make more, so you spend more, so you develop an ulcer, so you have a heart attack, so what? It is assumed that, "You poor slob, we are going to do something for you. We are going to let you share in the benefits of the American economy. You too can have hypertension, an ulcer, and premature grayness, and indebtedness." That is not necessarily an Indian's assessment.

Many of the people who are professionals said, "We realize that the reservation economy could be developed. We would like to see directed growth on the reservation." But their attitude was, "Look, I have been out there, I have been in the high-income bracket. And when you ask me what I want, I would just as soon go back to the reservation. If I get any amount of money together that even allows me to live very simply, that is what I am going to do." People who went to universities said the same thing: "Look, I went to the university. I participated in your educational system. The only reason I am working here is to get enough money to support a farming enterprise, which otherwise I couldn't do. Because farming on any degree requires some sort of cash assets."

Mangum: How widespread do you feel that view is, Kathy? Is this something that was found in a few individuals, or is this a rather general view? Do we have any data on what happens to most educated Indians, for instance?

Pete Homer: I think all the people that I have been involved with, the Indian people in Phoenix that run projects and programs who are from San Carlos or the Navajo Reservation, are there for the reason she mentioned: Because there is not the type of job we are trained for, we have gone to college, we have got the experience, we are working with projects. But if we had a project like that back home, we would go into that. If we could get the Anglo out of the BIA, who is sitting on that reservation and administrating these programs in public health, then we could get back there and have all those jobs ourselves.

Griffin: May I add to what Pete has said and draw an illustration? In the Office of Education we are pretty excited about the new Indian projects under Title IV. Something is happening that is new: Sometimes universities are now subcontracting with Indian schools. They provide the services which are needed so that the people in the particular community will be trained to work in that area in terms of the specific needs of that area.

Just yesterday somebody asked me, "What about a mission school which is in a certain area which has been doing a most remarkable job in special education?" I don't mind mentioning it, I'm talking about St. Michaels. There is no question whatsoever about the innovative and effective things that that school has done for the Indian people. Now the question is, can that experience be drawn upon now through this particular funding? It can. You see, we are working very hard to make the funding serve in the ways Kathy is talking about.

McKee: The whole crux of the matter for the Indians is self-determination. If you grow up on a reservation and you see everybody in the BIA from the social worker to the doctors at PHS making such assinine mistakes, even when you are speaking in English they think you are speaking in a foreign language because they just can't seem to comprehend what the problems really are. Then you can hardly wait to come back and take over their jobs because of what you have gone through. The whole point on the Indian reservations is, "Let's get all these other people out who have flubbed up so badly. Let's get some direction on our own. We want to do it for ourselves, and this may differ from some of the other groups." However, there are problems of being stuck in the same old bureaucratic structure.

Very often the Indian in BIA or the public health service becomes a bag man. He doesn't really make the decisions, but he sure catches the flak when they are unpopular with the community. A person can smile about it, but it is very destructive because it means that professional people who could make positive input into the community through the very structure of the system are being alienated from their own communities. This is something that has concerned many Indian professionals.

Right now the going price for an Indian professional is relatively high. I have had people tell me to get a Ph.D., and I can think of jobs where you can make over $30,000 a year because a lot of companies would like to have an Indian sitting at a desk. But to reach a point of acquiring an education, of acquiring the tools, and being able to go back to the community and serve as a resource is a difficult process. Very often project plans recognize that since the projects were to be set up in an area with a high concentration of chicanos, or American Indians, ideally these populations should run the operation. There are no manpower training programs to train people to work in any of these programs; therefore, the plan says, for at least the first three of the five years a labor force will be imported from outside the Four Corners* Regional Commission to run the factories to "manpower" the projects.

Griffin: Kathy, did you see my point that two or three things are happening through education? The thing that I want to come through loud and clear is that this whole process has to start with children. The manpower thing that you do up here of course is important too, Nevertheless the big thrust has got to come when little kids are geared to being able to occupy leadership positions within their own community. As it is now, they are having to use the most ridiculous books and teaching materials, etc. In their educational system, for too long all over the country the Indian kids are turned off by education.

---

*Editor's note: The Four Corners Region encompasses that area where four states meet at a single point: Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

McKee: I would have to respond to that on two levels. I agree. The corruptness is not one that starts on the top level. It is in the very basic philosophies of the system of eradicating what people's own priorities might be and telling them, what they are going to have to believe in to psychologically survive. But one of the things that is very frightening is if you have a large population of people between the ages of 25 and 40. These people have gone through really ragged years with BIA, being confronted with the change of educational philosophy every three or four years. They have not experienced success. They have been pushed "from pillar to post." Sent to the cities. How could you honestly accept teaching, dealing human beings off as excess baggage or garbage? One of the immediate needs is to critically assess these people as adults. Hopefully they have ten to twenty more profitable years of their lives to go through. What are we going to do about it? You are right, we have to attack it at the preschool and elementary and secondary level. But we have a large population of people thirty years and older, and we have to deal with them. Right now they are being made to feel that if they crawled under the ground and were never seen again, it would make a lot of people's consciences feel much more calm; or a lot of educators would have a much more smoothly flowing system. But the fact remains that they are there, and whether or not they are victims or survivors, something has got to be done with them.

Canchola: The elder people culturally and traditionally teach their children. When their fourth grade children are coming home with homework that they don't understand and cannot do . . . this age group is really a tough age group for Indian people on the reservation.

Crawford: What compounds this problem with older people is that every time you get money for training projects and you get a criteria for evaluating that project, the people running the project want it to look as good as it can possibly look because they are not going to get any more money if they don't succeed. Therefore, the people who are the most unlikely to succeed are weeded out. You can get to the very young a little better; so let's ignore these others because they are not going to learn as quickly.

Griffin: In one program where the control of the funds, the assignment of personnel, was always for the Anglo, the chicanos said, "You have two choices: Either you change that, or you don't have a program." Then they demonstrated that we could not get along without them. In other words, they could disrupt the program, they could interrupt it, they could harass the hell out of it. The consequence of that was that the director of the program resigned and was replaced by a chicano, and then he in turn hired another chicano who hired another, and the whole program became a chicano program.

Crawford: I would like to make a couple of points in relation to this Indian section. I have seen white instructors working with Indians. I have heard them say, "Do you understand?" Almost every time the Indian would answer, "Yes." If you were there, you knew the answer was "No." But the instructor didn't know this. I have seen kids go almost all the way through high school before someone with sense discovered that the kid didn't know how to read and the reason he was a discipline problem was that he had no idea of what was going on. Somehow for ten years the teachers had never discovered that the kid didn't know how to read because they said, "Do you understand?" and he said, "Yes."

In the study, for example, in Chapter 6, page 18, it says it is not culture, it is poverty, and one of the examples you use to point that out is another observation by an instructor in Oklahoma, that his trainees who came from rural Mississippi were considerably more deprived than even his poor Oklahoma trainees and had a significantly lower level of language skills than the Oklahomans. You evidently had an instructor that had never been to Mississippi. But he read somewhere that the Mississippi Choctaws were poorer than the Oklahoma Indians, so he could reason that their language skills were lower and blame it on poverty rather than culture. Well, that is a lie. The language skills of the Choctaws are lower because they have a reservation, where Oklahoma Indians are totally integrated into the white society.

Now there is not too many degrees of difference to starvation. You can say one person is starving more than another, but that doesn't mean a lot. The thing is that all the Choctaws speak Choctaw, and this is true from the cradle through their lifetime; the only time that they do not speak Choctaw is for the 45-minute class periods a day that they are in school. Most of that time they turn to their classmate and speak Choctaw to him. They try to make replies in English. Even among the Choctaw communities in Mississippi, there are about four different dialects of Choctaw, and each has a little trouble understanding the other. This is the reason, not the degree of their starvation that deprives them of language skills. Yet this is the basic point which you use to prove that it is poverty rather than culture.

In the Indian culture, each age group of children had responsibility for the age group below. For five- to ten-year-olds, there was an age group of twelve- to fifteen-year-olds who show them their roles in society. This was completely broken up when white men tried to make Indians white. They brought complete and total disorganization. On some reservations parents had no control over their children whatsoever.

Most of the trainees for the Indian programs come from employment assistance through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It picks these trainees from certain trades, and they are supposed to have a certain degree of education. Therefore those in training programs are a based sample. If you want to know what the cultural traits really are, you have got to go back to this mass that is not even involved.

Canchola: At Santa Carlos we developed programs in range management and veterinary science because that is what the tribe wanted. They were put together by the different ranches on the reservation, and we then tried to get people at the state level to allow us to go to the different ranches and train whoever was already there -- the cowboys, the stockmen -- they didn't allow this. They wanted us to get somebody different, a younger person. The younger person could be someone out of high school or someone that was 21 or 22. We had to allow that to happen from grassroots, or we wouldn't get the money for the training.

We also lost another program. It was the request of the tribe that we train people in law enforcement to do a better job on the reservation. They did not allow that because they wanted other people that were not there already, who would then go out to Globe or Phoenix or someplace else to get a job. So I asked them again for monies to train in basic education in English and general education. They said "You can't do that. You have got to train in the occupations that we know we can place you in Phoenix." They have destroyed everyone of our programs as we went along. So then I said to myself, "I am going to do it anyway. I am the administrator. I am the director of the center. I am going to do what I want." Then the state employment service and education people shot me down every once in a while.

I allow whatever holidays that are significant to the San Carlos tribe. I don't worry about Christmas and the Fourth of July and what have you. I give them their pay. This is up to the local administration, and this is what the federal government wants; that you deal with it at the local level. This is why I would like to emphasize that those of you who are administrators, who have been administrators, and want to develop administrators, learn who your people are so you can deal with it that way, and you have the prerogative and the power as an administrator to do those things that will create the desire to learn. A chicano I had as one of my students in the eighth grade in 1965 is married now and has a child; he said, "Mr. Canchola, you were always harder on us than anyone else in the whole school." I said, "I didn't realize that, but maybe subconsciously I was."

What happens is that these administrators and counselors don't want to take the time. I, as an administrator, found myself still getting drunk with the Indians. I still found myself punching cows with the Indians, and we were in class learning about what it means to participate. Participation means, "Are you ready to learn?" I was ready to teach. Don't forget to associate. When we are going to drive that truck or punch that cow, we are going to do it equally because of our physical machismo type of thing. This is what a lot of administrators are forgetting. They are caught up in their own bureaucracy or higher social status, and they move out of the district. That is why I still live in the barrio.

What I am saying is really that you as an administrator take the prerogative to do the things that you think are necessary, and quit worrying about some of the guidelines that you think exist, if you are willing to do it because of the reprimand you are going to get. The reprimands that I got were very difficult, but they also knew that I was correct and that is why I remained there. What finally happened was that they took my money away and there was no longer a center.

Casavantes: In the back of every proposal for funding you will note that there is a little checkmark that says "civil rights [something] complied with." "civil rights not complied with." Every institution either says "no," in which case it is ignored, or it says "yes," in which case it is ignored also. So everybody says "yes."

Consequently all you have to do if you can see that it is not happening is file suit and after a while, you don't even have to do that. All you have to do to have it stopped (not even at the initial review committee but at the person who checks and logs in the proposal in the National Institute of Health or in OE) is say, "You haven't given us the breakdown of your ethnic population." You know your director, assistant director, deputy director, workers, field workers, teachers, instructors. What is their ethnic breakdown? Without this, you haven't complied with page 32. You send the damn thing right back. Now if we can get that done, we will have accomplished more because then all of these recommendations will have "punch." Otherwise, you have to go around convincing people that we are good people and that these are nice ideas to carry out.

Tom Law: I just want to make an observation about the term "action." When you really get down to the nitty-gritty, action is a bunch of rhetoric. What is really happening is that there are various circumlocutions about the language and drawing in to the local community to deal with it in their own way. It is just like the language that came out with desegregation "with all deliberate speed." Desegregation with all deliberate speed could mean a thousand years to some local communities. But the government has not been forthright enough to say, "Okay, you guys, affirmative action means this, this, this, and this." This is the time line, and you don't want to use the word "quota"; it is a bad word. But I am here to tell you that the word "quota" has been in operation for minorities all along because the quota has been zero. Why not use quotas now? We won't say specifically that "yes" against these state that the percentage ought to be this or that because the government won't let us use quotas.

Casavantes: The worst that can happen is that the number of minority groups hired will increase. The Commission on Civil Rights was having a hearing in St. Louis on housing or something. It just happened that at that precise moment in time, McDonald Douglas was awarded something like $2.5 billion to build war aircraft. Apart from your feelings about the war and war aircraft there was nevertheless $2.5 billion to spend. We just hauled in their president and their personnel manager and subpoenaed them and said, "How many blacks in the St. Louis area?" They had to find out, and we knew already.

We said, "How many blacks do you have on your staff?" The answer was "None." "Since you are going to have to do a lot of hiring, you are going to hire a lot of blacks and chicanos, aren't you?" "Oh, absolutely, gentlemen." Believe it or not the number of blacks and chicanos hired (there are a few in St. Louis) is fairly high. I agree with you that many times when they talk about quotas, a lot is rhetoric, but at least we can hope that things will improve.

Crawford: The one thing that has done the most good for the Indian tribes and the one thing that they are the most disturbed about losing is OEO [Office of Economic Opportunity]. The reason they have been disturbed about losing OEO, and the reason that Indians in particular were not able to do things and move was because they didn't have a chance to get into it. You have to have money to write proposals. You have to be able to support somebody that is writing proposals. Then you have the machinery to do it. OEO gives money to these groups for them to spend themselves. Now if they get the money in and they administer their own programs, they hire their own people; then if they fail, their people can turn to their own people to blame, not the government, not the various federal agencies. Why not have more plans like OEO that are going to give these particular groups the direct responsibility for saving, planning, and helping them squeeze money out of the other agencies to use like they know it should be used? Instead [they] go back to some contract that shouldn't have been made in the first place and was only made to take advantage of money because it is better than having none, even if it wasn't what they needed.

Simpkins: The proposal for this project, as I remember, presupposed that there were cultural and linguistic variables affecting the nondominant population group members.

The question was, "What were these?" There was implication that whatever they were arose from the nondominant population group members. When we carried the first test instrument into the field, the questions were designed to sample for any manifestations of cultural and linguistic barriers resulting from some internalized kind of characteristic on the part of the blacks. The attempt was rejected by the people we had requested to respond. They said, "This is the same old stuff all over again. You have already presupposed everything." Then we had to deal with it from the standpoint of the observations which they had made: It is not anything inherent in these people [that is] creating a lack of success in the training program or success in vocational endeavors. It is the culture of those who designed the programs for them.

We then developed a questionnaire which we thought they could respond to, with an opportunity to state what they had to say. An example of that questionnaire is incorporated in the draft of the report. What they were trying to tell us is shown here on page 4-11. It is the culture of those who are making policies and determining the direction of the programs -- who will enter and who will not, etc. -- that give rise to any negative outcome or shortcomings on the part of blacks, or as a whole. The general public as well as the employer might have to be educated away from the cultural hang-ups they have that suggest that what they identify as cultural behavior in others (because of cosmetic reasons or otherwise) do not really affect their ability to learn subject matter. I think that what is contained in this final draft is generally and basically the evidence that we discovered and it is the crux of the whole matter. It is the other culture imposing itself.

In two Skills Centers in California, the students were permitted to attend classes wearing their hats. The student population is basically chicano, and they were permitted to wear their hair shoulder length. The administrator indicated that he found no relationship between success in the program and the length of the hair or whether one wore a hat in the class. They were having tremendous success on the part of their students. But, on the other hand, at a Skills Center in New Jersey, the director complained that the course in human awareness of minority histories was creating a problem, and he just didn't think that the blacks needed that anyway. He had it discontinued. At the same time he complained about the lack of success on the part of the enrollees.

Now in Oakland, California, and in Harlem where the attempts to administer the questionnaire were rejected by the staff, I was basically told: "This whole matter is something else initiated by 'the man' against us, and they just selected you to administer the test in order to tranquilize us to get what they need." Here again the cultural thing creeps in. The populations in these instances were people who we might believe would have been somewhat "homogenized" in their cultural language with that of the dominant population, since there was every indication that they had achieved degrees in institutions of higher learning which usually result in that kind of thing (cultural and linguistic homogenization). Even if they had, they had had so many experiences based on someone else's perception of their culture that they were antagonized and distrustful.

That is what raised a question here this morning. Who is making these decisions that there need to be various kinds of training programs, directed toward certain kinds of efforts [and] populations? Were these people brought in to find out what they thought? Blacks preferred to be taught by blacks for the most part because of the empathy that they considered would flow. Here again is a suggestion that those who were not considered black would not be empathetic or even have the kind of awareness of their needs as one who has shared the same kind of environment. I think it is very valid. If we had to go out and do this all over again we would find the same thing.

Simpkins: I think the report should be significant to those who are administering the programs from a central point, the Office of Education and [Department of] Labor, and whoever else is participating in funding the manpower programs. There needs to be some further direction in real staff development, generating [from those offices] to those who want to administer the programs at a lower level, and suggest to them that they do ensure proper screening and staff development, and maybe even internships, before a staff is employed so they can have some assurance that these kinds of perceptions that generate negative behavior toward the student population would not exist in those who are employed in the staff.

Canchola: We need to change the attitudes of the teachers. Not only in Skills Centers but in education-type systems to get them to include more minorities.

Crawford: There are Indians who would rather go back to the reservation and be hungry than to go to Chicago or some other place and gain success.

Simpkins: The Indian should have self-determination. He should have the right to go back to that reservation if he wishes. The fact that there is a reservation is in question -- that he might want to go back to it. Okay if he goes back, there can't be policies established to form economic programs on that reservation. Why does he have to go to the reservation without those things? Why does he have to leave in the first place for economic growth? That is what we are addressing ourselves to here. We are recommending that you address yourselves to poverty, and this covers the whole bag. That is why I am suggesting that maybe someone will have to explain the intent of this to those who might really be concerned.

Hailes: I think that in trying to address ourselves to poverty and education and to whatever we are going to concern ourselves with, you have to address yourself to all the forces that have an interplay upon an individual. I am going to give you a case in point. In Washington, D. C., our experience has been with predominantly black and Spanish-speaking people. Anybody who comes there -- you want to motivate them to get a job. The requirement is that anybody who has any infraction with the law can't get a job. Any person in Washington, D.C., who is sixteen years old or over and black, [and] who has not had some type of encounter with the law, is lucky. So we deal with that, to get that straightened out. So they come up with another one: "Alright, you don't have a high school diploma, you can't get a job." We try to address ourselves to that. Then we move into that and they say, "If a person can do the job, he doesn't have to have a diploma." What does a high school diploma mean? By the time we get through with that, they say that he has to pass a test. The test is culturally biased and he can't pass the test. Or they take these kids out of the ghettos and take them down to the Civil Service Commission with all those marble walls, with all those beautiful offices, and want him to relate to that. He can't. He failed the test. So we try to deal with that. Then when you find a system in which all the laws are made by the dominant forces, interpreted by the dominant forces, enforced by the dominant forces, and imposed upon minorities by the dominant forces, there is something wrong with that structure. I know when I went to one of these lily white schools, ivy league schools, when I went in for my interview I was the only black in the whole school there. When I went for my interview, the first thing the fellow said to me was, "We are happy to have you here. We don't have blacks here because blacks come in two categories -- either dumb or smart."

We have to deal with the attitude of the dominant group because the attitude of the dominant group is that all minorities are inferior. They are not supposed to get too much. We are supposed to get what they give us. Until we can address ourselves to that, we just sit around here doing nothing. We are spinning our wheels.

We of the minorities ought to do a study on the majorities and see what they come up with because attitude has to be changed. Now they have the power and we have to develop a technique as to how we are going to survive under the dominations of power. Some of us here have developed a technique as to how we are going to survive, but it is not one that will lend itself to the development of our potential because we have to spend so much time trying to survive that we can't even find the cure for cancer.

Casavantes: In a school where there is an Indian caucus, chicano caucus, or a black student organization, minority students spend a significant portion of their time in the activist movement doing something about changing their status quo, enhancing their situation, and helping each other and themselves. The average white, Anglo-Saxon, middle-class type -- all he has to do is leave class and go to his room and study. Nobody has that much of their time in a day just to survive. I think that is a very good point. I go with you, but I go beyond that to the point where you have to spend time surviving.

Duffin: The report says: "A. There are no cultural and language barriers peculiar to blacks which pose significant obstacles to successful vocational training" [page 4-1]. When I read that, I assumed that the researchers and interviewers are saying that because of my background as a black, when I get to a manpower training program I should have no hang-ups in learning. Is that a correct assumption?

Simpkins: We wrote from the context of the original proposal, which suggested that there was an inherent kind of behavior typical of, say, blacks. We found this not to be the case.

There is nothing inherent that causes the blacks to just have to have that kind of language pattern or whatever.

Duffin: So you are saying you didn't find that to be a result of your study. The other thing is that you found that we don't have any cultural hang-ups that keep us from learning.

Simpkins: Right.

Duffin: Now to me that means that my whole background doesn't stop me from learning. Right? No matter [that] I was in the inner city from kindergarten through twelfth, I should have no cultural barriers to keep me from learning. I am presuming that you were basing it all on the questionnaire that was asked of the MDTA program, the OIC, whoever is in manpower programs. Right?

Simpkins: Yes. We are addressing it to the findings, limited to the questionnaire, the anecdotal notations, and the survey of the literature.

Duffin: Let's put a pin in that. Let me go on to the next one. I'll come back to that. Let's go to the "B," the next one that you find.

The next conclusion is: "B. Staff misconceptions that assume the existence of cultural and language variables that do not, in fact, exist create an atmosphere of poor communications that hinders training performance and may also limit the occupations to which trainees are assigned" [page 4-10]. Now are you telling me then that the same people you went to said, "No, culturally we don't have any problems." You came to an obvious conclusion that the same staff you are getting the answers from have misconceptions about the trainees?

"C. Most, if not all the factors which seem to affect the general performances of blacks in training programs are the result of past and present discriminations, and the socioeconomic deprivation many of them have experienced in such areas as income, education, and housing" [page 4-13]. Are you telling me, based upon that statement, that we still don't have a cultural hang-up?

Simpkins: Right. That is what we are telling you. What the report is saying is that the income, housing, and economics are something different from culture.

It is not imposed upon the population group by itself, but from outside forces. Okay, let's deal with it on a brotherly basis. We all were subjected to similar kinds of circumstances. We were poor. We could move about in the same kinds of environments, that so-called ghetto environment, and survive. We could speak the vernacular. But we also -- whether it was providential or otherwise -- were able to get out of that milieu and into some schools, etc., and negotiate that. And here we are, which indicates that having that same culture, being exposed to that same culture, did not hinder us from being able to arrive at the station at which we exist at this time.

Okay. If we deal with the exception without giving the rule a chance, I think there would be a fallacy in the conclusion. What is suggested here is that if all things were equal, the results would be equal. I am saying that if you take an Appalachian white from Virginia or Kentucy, bring him out here and give him the benefits of everything without the kinds of restraints you would give a black, and even if you brought a black and gave him equal access as you did the whites, they are going to arrive at those stations.

Duffin: My problem is that nowhere in America, maybe in the world, is a black going to have that opportunity, or an Indian, or a chicano, or an Appalachian white, because our culture is such that we are not going to make it out. We are not going to inherit the earth.

If you are saying that all we blacks have to do is pull ourselves up by the bootstraps and we haven't made it out in 300 years, I guess I have a problem with the word "culture." The problem is that it is inherent. It is our culture. It is just the same as the other cultures. If that is the given, maybe the definition of the word "culture" has me hung up because I don't see that pattern changing because of the predominance of the Anglo-Saxon. Your study is saying if every man on the earth is given an equal chance, he can learn. I don't think that's what the study is. The study is the difference in language and cultural variables in manpower programs, and I think they are kind of set in terms of culture.

Simpkins: You have supported what we are trying to say here. The blacks have the same culture as anyone else. Okay. What I've said to Leroy is that removing some of these restraints that are imposed by design, and that is in the report; then the blacks can move ahead the same as anyone else in their performance and in their vocational aspirations. We are not dealing with whether or not the dominant culture, as you say, is going to give up that headstart.

Duffin: If the findings get out of the small print and support the hypotheses, then I think you have something going for you. But if it remains in the small print, we will all have a problem because we will look alike. We sit at this table and nod our heads when we are saying, "No."

We haven't addressed ourselves to "D" yet. "D. Blacks are particularly likely to reject training opportunities in what they perceive from a background of discrimination to be demeaning occupations" [page 4-23]. That is also part of the culture. It isn't that I don't want to be a custodian, it's the fact that being a custodian has a bad connotation. It is the same way with vocational education in the United States. Until we take the stigma away from vocational education, until we put the emphasis on career education (where we might be doing it now if Dr. Marland has his way), until middle-class whites start taking vocational education and manpower programs, they will be relegated to minorities. That is an unfortunate thing. I gave you the impression before that education will take away manpower. It won't because, with the needs changing in skill, obviously, what we really need is quality education coupled with manpower, when it's offered with jobs that exist. I didn't want to give you the impression that we do away with manpower. I would not like to see that at all, and education just in itself is not significant. It is significant when it is coupled with meaningful jobs.

Crawford: I really got misunderstood when I was talking. The problem is what comes out if you don't read between the lines. For example, on page 8-4 it says, "For blacks, Appalachian whites, most chicanos, and many native Americans, there are no linguistic variables that create serious obstacles . . . ." Then you go into the poverty thing. A great many people would draw the conclusion that if you take any chicano who doesn't speak English, who speaks Spanish, if you take a Navajo who doesn't speak English, you take a black who does speak English, an Appalachian white who does speak English, give them all enough money, plenty of money, and take away their other worries, you can teach them all in the same way, and they will be able to learn just fine. That is not so.

Simpkins: That was taken under consideration also. We studied the area up and down. We had a computerized printout. I assume you are familiar with the ERIC system of teacher education . . . what we found was that there were a lot of assumptions included in that. For instance, there are cultural and linguistic variables, but never any specific cultural and linguistic variables identified. The implications are that if the blacks and others fail, they are entirely responsible. What I am saying is the opposite. When they fail, the manpower or vocational staffs have the responsibility of finding the proper way of making that person a success.

Crawford: If you don't point out what are the cultural and linguistic variances that these teachers are not taking into consideration, you say, "Well it is not relevant because it is not a variable to learning." If you are using traditional education, and these people do have their variances within traditional education, these are a barrier. And if you do not identify them, the teachers have no idea what barriers to overcome by changing their ideas. If you want to call it prejudices, okay, then they are prejudices.

Casavantes: Your statement, I have come to realize, is really a hypothetical statement, of only theoretical relevance. It happens to be absolutely true. But I think you will be misinterpreted and misread by everyone. I read it because I knew what you were talking about. But I must join the chorus. It must be preceded by a phrase like, "This is almost never found because of racial characteristics which impede through poverty, through education, through job selection." Incidently, you should also put down they are racial because people say, "Well, maybe blacks are not culturally inferior, but they are racially inferior." I suggest you put the word racial in there. If we could find this circumstance, we will find that there are no racial or cultural barriers that impede learning. Beyond this, there are some formal studies -- again, that I will be glad to furnish you with -- that show it is possible to actually learn at an accelerated pace under certain condiditons, even for the people from poverty backgrounds.

Robson: I would like to come back [to this] in a minute or two, because there may be a danger that you are reading something here that isn't here, and I would like to take this up again. But before we do that, let's turn to Tom Law.

Law: I would like to go with culture. I think that is where I have my hang-ups. The operational definition of culture itself. . . it seems to me that you have come up with a theoretical concept of culture rather than an operational definition for the study. The way it really is, is all of these things in "C" are a part of my culture --

the black man's culture. Culture is the sum total of all the experiences that one has been subjected to. Your hypothesis somehow has to state that were it not for these circumstances, the blacks could, in fact, perform at the same level.

I would also like to make a statement about vocational education. We have been caught in this bag of higher education and trying to develop what is acceptable. If in many schools -- if your catalog and your job description does not read the same as Harvard's -- then it is not academically respectable. So we are going to have to do the same thing. We are somehow going to have to make vocational and technical education academically respectable. One good way to do it is through career education. With reference to the levels of aspiration of black people -- in this country the whole spectrum of occupational choice has always been black jobs and white jobs. I don't care what anybody says, it has always been that. You can still walk into the personnel office in large corporations and have a whole list of jobs there. They will be very happy to show you the jobs they perceive you can do as a black man, whatever your qualifications are. That's alright, but I want to be chairman of the board. That is the kinds of levels of aspiration that the minorities have to deal with. Somehow we need to affect these aspiration levels vis-a-vis these manpower programs.

Crawford: I have to tell each of my white male teachers that when he is teaching Choctaws, he is not teaching middle-aged women because they are going to slam their books shut and are not going to speak to him or answer him. You can say that is his prejudices because he doesn't take into account some of these factors.

What are these types of things that do interfere with learning situations? I don't think that black middle-aged women that I have worked with have this hang-up. Maybe we are both poor, but we still don't both have the same reasons for being poor. We both don't still have the same kinds of educational things to overcome. Saying that there are no linguistic or cultural variables that interfere with learning is wrong.

Duffin: I think dominance is really who owns what. Whites own the industry in the United States. That is dominant. We are not going to turn that around. Even if we burned the whole damn place down, we couldn't run it anyway. That is only because of experience. When the Indians are driving a Fortuna 500, and make their way, when blacks have a G.M., when Appalachian whites get into the mainstream of production, then we will all be sitting around talking about someone else in the manpower and in the cultural barriers. When I own EXXON, I will give all the blacks the opportunity to be in the front office.

So when you say "dominance," you can't just say dominance of whites in terms of more of them, you have got to talk about who really controls the variables and also why our culture leads us into certain pursuits. That won't change. I am saying until I become a producer or an involved person, I will have to accept the less dominant role. What you are saying, though, is if we want to stay in a certain locale and population, the stigma is always going to be with us.

Robson: Can I back up a minute and take us in a slightly different direction? We start out with a basic proposition on which there is no dispute. The report is accused of saying you can lump blacks, chicanos, Indians, and Appalachian whites together and somehow know how to treat them as the same. If anyone reads the report and comes up with that kind of a conclusion, then we have got to rewrite the report. We don't think it says that. What it says is that you can't generalize about all blacks, all chicanos, all Indians, all Appalachian whites. Having once said that you can't generalize, then for purposes of the report, we go ahead with some generalizations. We get down to saying in the particular definition of culture and linguistic or language problems, there is not a culture of blacks, or a culture of chicanos, or a culture of Indians, or a language that is a barrier to learning and achievement.

Now your question as I understand it is: But for the barrio or for the ghetto, for the persons who we say are socioeconomically deprived (which is not just a matter of income, it is a matter of a whole range of attitudes and self-perceptions) let me summarize it one more time because I want to make sure I understand what you are saying -- that all of those factors we may identify as a culture of the ghetto or a culture of the barrio, and that the socioeconomical culture of the Indians on a reservation in rural isolation is very different from the urban kind of problem.

The report doesn't try to equate them. Maybe in the report we ought to talk about more of the culture of poverty and the ghetto situation because you think that is what culture really means. The report is very clear that for both chicanos and Indians, there are serious language problems. The problems are bilingual problems. They have very poor facility with either their native language or with English which is the dominant language for both training and employment so far as vocational manpower programs. That language may be cultural in the sense that if there is a culture, the language is a part of it. The existence of a bilingual language is not in itself a barrier to training. It simply means as the report says that you may have to spend more time and more effort to develop the facility in both the native language and the English language in order to achieve the degree of success for those who have that problem. It is not a universal problem for any people in that group. English is the dominant language for all groups in our society. That is essentially what the finding was.

Molins: I think what you are saying is that there is no barrier to learning, but that there is a barrier to learning in terms of fulfilling or realizing the promise of learning in a white-dominated culture.

Robson: Well, I think we are relatively clear on that. It is the perceptions of the dominant culture about the nondominant culture that cause all kinds of problems in teaching, all those things that deal with the achievement of minority students in the educational system.

McKee: In your opening statement you say that blacks, American Indians, chicanos are distinctively different groups with different problems. The question that comes to mind is: If they are distinctively different groups, if each group is complex, if each one has its own problems, then how do you justify lumping all three of them together in a single study? This imposes limits on what you can really say and the depths with which you can discuss the issues, which provokes another question: "Is this another exercise of show and tell for members of minority groups to have lip service paid to them?" When in fact whenever the final report comes out it will simply say what it wants to say without necessarily reflecting accurately the community viewpoint and without necessarily being implemented as knowledge or used. I guess that is a classic way of saying, "Are we being used?"

Crawford: I don't think it states here that you were supposed to go out and find out if these cultural traits were inferior or superior. But it only states that it was supposed to show how it inhibited learning, and I think that there are definite factors that show, not that Navajo is an inferior language to English, but that not speaking

English is a barrier to our training programs. If that was the way it was supposed to come out, then that's the way it should have been stated in the report and then it would not have been misunderstood.

By using vague words you are doing the same thing. "C. For blacks, Appalachian whites, most chicanos, and many native Americans, there are no linguistic variables that create serious obstacles to the learning process . . ." [page 8-4]. How many is many? In all of these groups, English tends to be the dominant language. You mean that tends to be the dominant language they speak?

Mangum: What it says is that in this country, most people in these groups have English as a dominant language. I don't know how many, but for many people from Spanish-speaking backgrounds, many people from American Indian backgrounds, English is their accustomed tongue.

Crawford: May I ask you to take every full-blooded Indian in the United States and see with how many of them English is the dominant language. Since Navajo is the largest tribe, we'll use them for an example. Why don't you see how many Navajos have English as the dominant language?

Mangum: The majority. What is your estimate?

Crawford: How many of them, when they go home, speak English?

Homer: I would say about 5 percent.

Don Smith: How many native Americans do you have that are living off the reservation in major metropolitan areas, Chicago, the northeast section of the country? Any type of native American.

Crawford: The problem is that you have some Indians who have virtually disappeared and are white Indians to that effect. Those Indians do not and should not even be included in a study on Indians because for all practical purposes, they aren't Indians.

Mangum: We could argue for a long time about what the proportion is in each of these groups, and that is one of those kinds of things that you have to go out and try to find out. I think that it is just a generalization that we are an English-dominated society. It depends somewhat on age, the younger they are, the more true that generalization would be. People are growing up in an increasingly English-language-dominated society. The more isolated they are, the less true that is. Some portions of the Indian population and some portions of the Spanish population do have serious language obstacles. Other portions don't have.

Crawford: But this interests me because I asked about the Navajos, and one of your colleagues said the majority of them speak English as the dominant language. Somebody down here at this end said about 5 percent of them.

Mangum: That's why I raised that as a question, and I was surprised at the answer. I still argue that for the younger population, it would be true that the majority . . . .

Homer: Only while they are listening to the teacher. As soon as they leave the schoolground, it is all Navajo.

Mangum: It seems to me that the point where it makes a difference is when you can start thinking in a language. If you have to think and translate, then you have got a problem.

Canchola: This is the same thing that is happening in a lot of the parts of Texas, Arizona, and places like up and down the Modesto, the Fresno, and the San Dimas where again the Mexican-American is doing the same thing. I am trying to understand what the rest room is, and I don't know what it is. And I was holding it off because I don't know how to ask the teacher where to go to the rest room. Again that is happening also, and we are going back to our Spanish or Mexican or whatever we speak. Teachers assume already they have learned their a, b, c, 's and are already in the fourth or fifth grade.

The migrant problem is evident, yet they don't really see it and do something about it. They just keep pushing it along with a lack of sensitivity, because they don't have the right economic situation or they don't have the right pair of shoes, or pair of levis (compared to something out of Penneys), or not having the better pencil or the better type of candy bar, or having to settle for something that is three-for-a-penny instead of something that costs 5 cents. They make fun of you as you do that because your shirt is not as good as somebody else's. All of these are cultural.

Mangum: Ed, are there any data on the proportion of the Spanish-speaking people?

Casavantes: Yes, there is. We have two very good studies on this. One of them is our own, which actually is very conservative and shows that approximately half of all Mexican-American youngsters entering school speak English as well as their Anglo peers. Now, clearly, as they go along, they will gain more expertise in the area of English. So for the Mexican-Americans -- and I speak only of the Mexican-Americans -- your statement is accurate. But again I am joining this chorus that you evidently don't want to accept: Once you make the declarative statement that is valid, it should be followed by a series of "howevers."

Crawford: This is the problem with the study. We have a man on the Choctaw Reservation with several MA degrees and we have a remedial reading specialist that comes in with his machines and says, "Now, any third grade child can read at this speed." The man with several MAs says, "But I can't translate that fast." Anybody who is doing a study would say that English is his dominant language if they talked to him, and they would be wrong.

Homer: All the people you deal with in Window Rock are 74 counselors. It is all done in Navajo. All their business transactions, all their business transactions, all the board of regents' meetings at Navajo Community College are done in Navajo.

Casavantes: You are talking nationwide, and perhaps words like that ought to be used, only in certain localities. I cannot speak for all Indians as a whole. I will say it for Spanish-speaking, and that is that you can get from the census, or from our own study, that the use of Spanish is decreasing in each generation.

Mangum: Were you ever able to find any data on that for Indians, Kathy? I have never seen anything.

McKee: One of the problems is that some of the studies done have been done for the purpose of a Senate subcommittee, and you get a manipulation of the facts. One report says that everything is "copacetic" in the realm of Indian education, so there is no reading problem. Another says that there is a 60 percent illiteracy rate within the Indian community. In terms of consistent data, no I haven't seen any.

Crawford: To go one step further, nobody knows how many Indians there are because so many white census takers won't go way back into the hills to find them. We have got about 2,000 more Choctaws than they say we have. We know they are there. The Census Department won't recognize that they are there, and that makes a big difference in the figures also.

Canchola: Seventy percent of the students in the '71 and '72 year were Mexican-American in the MDTA programs in Arizona. In the last part of '72 and '73, there were quite a number of Indians listed on the San Carlos Reservation and the southern Fort Defiance area. Yet, no one in those areas was being trained in carpentry or electricity. They couldn't get into the trades. They couldn't pass the test. The tests that were given were all those words that they couldn't understand because of all the complicated verb tenses that chicanos don't have in English, that the Indians don't have in English, yet they knew how to perform the work, but they were not being tested that way. I am very good at speaking the English language, but a lot of the time I get a little bit lost. I have only learned in the last few years how to deal with my superiors who were mostly Anglo. But I see all my friends who have not got to this point. They lose continuity of thought, and that is a culture characteristic

Robson: Could we come back a minute to the specifics where we were before the coffee break? I think it is relevant that we get your best thoughts on this. On page 3-8 we start to set out those culture factors that we are really studying. There were initially eight categories or points of focus: linguistic variables, family structure, basic philosophies, time sense and competition, distribution of power and role expectations, environmental consciousness, self-concept, and socioeconomic values.

Each one of these represents a category on the questionnaire that people were asked to fill out. There are two kinds of problems that I think you have raised. One is that people may not have given the right answer on the questionnaire; but there isn't much that we can do about that now. What we did was question the administrators, counselors, and instructors in these programs, and then we interviewed and got the anecdotal material from enrollees. I thought I heard some people say there are some things that we just didn't consider. For example, Reva, you made one reference to middle-aged Choctaw women who would not accept a male instructor, or was it a male white instructor? Now what is the cultural variable broadly speaking, that is associated with that phenomenon?

Crawford: Definitely language. But I think language is part of the larger perception or philosophy, a way of perceiving things. Translating from one language to another goes beyond language into another cultural variable. You translate according to your own philosophy. Even though it means one thing in English, it means something else in whatever particular tribe you are in. Family structure is a characteristic such as extended families, what about the characteristics where there were extended families, and the extended families have been completely broken up? Not just extended familes; for instance, peer group structure patterns have been completely broken up, and there hasn't been anything to take their place. Outside the home, do you have factors of sex relationships and roles relating to people of other cultures or outside your family? I brought up our strength of religious belief. This again ties in with philosophy. I think you made one statement that is true, that the tribes differ so greatly that it is hard to lump all of them together. I think the main problem is that even after you try to identify these things, in the end you say it is not really relevant.

Casavantes: The statements are scientifically valid. You may have to have a degree in social science before these statements are intelligible, or two degrees, or three degrees in social science and a specialty in this type of thing before these things are actually interpretable.

Robson: Cultural characteristics simply do not have that much influence on a trainee's performance. Such efforts. . . .

Casavantes: Wait a minute. This is where I keep jumping in with a highly technical point. The fact that people who are from different ethnic or racial backgrounds do not have inferiority does not imply that there is not a difference in cognitive style. It simply means that the style is not inferior. Let me give you a corny analogy. If you talked to a black dentist, he simply will tell you that the jaw structure of most blacks is slightly different from the jaw structure of most whites. That does not mean that they have an inferior jaw structure or that the teeth are inferior, but that he has to understand certain things about the placement of the teeth. Black dentists know this.

Robson: You stopped me one sentence too soon. I think our next sentence deals with what you are talking about. Except in specific instances, noted cultural characteristics simply do not have that much influence on trainee performance. Such efforts--now these are the efforts of program curriculum developers--should instead be focused on developing staff training and orientation programs aimed at the elimination of stereotypes and misconceptions and making staff aware of those actual cultural characteristics that do exist.

Casavantes: The first point is fine. Destroy the stereotypes. The second one, especially in the case of the chicano, I defy you to find.

Mangum: Ed, in your last comment you defied us to find any actual cultural characteristics that exist. If so, that is what we have been saying -- essentially no cultural characteristics interfere with the ability to profit from skill training and vocational education.

Casavantes: They don't interfere if you understand them. For instance, if you don't understand machismo, which I don't understand -- I know it is there, but I don't know how it operates in different people -- if I don't understand it, I am not going to be able to teach an instructor what to do.

Mangum: It seems to me that it makes a difference whether this fact of machismo requires you to change your curriculum and teach a different way and use different materials because of it, or if you have to have the instructor understand the existence of that particular cultural attribute and attitude.

Crawford: Making them aware of it doesn't mean that they are going to be able to cope with it. A lot of people are aware of the differences without being able to know how to effectively teach, incorporating those things. Just being aware of them isn't enough, if they don't incorporate them and use them to their advantage.

Duffin: Am I to assume that we are talking about nonbilingual teachers? I guess my problem is, I think that the greatest thing would be that if everybody who was teaching on an Indian reservation speak both languages. I know in our program we have less difficulty if we take as a positive requirement that the teacher in the classroom is bilingual and can handle both languages. We go on through the process of trying to have an English teacher trying to teach only English. To my way of thinking, even if we're talking about curriculum developers, the secret, and maybe the recommendation is, that we ought to stop trying to get everybody just to learn English. I think the reason the Jewish religion and Israel are dominant is because they insist that when their children leave the English school they go to the Hebrew school. I am saying that I can't image us moving from an Indian reservation where we should have teachers who speak the language, Navajo or whatever.

We are talking about changing attitude. It is hard for white teachers in a black neighborhood. If they don't understand the ghetto, it immediately puts the teacher on the defensive. I think that is what your study is really showing -- that teachers don't really understand the students and are also apprehensive over that fact. If students whisper to each other and I don't understand, I get a little uptight over that because I don't know if they are talking about me. We say it is English as a second language, but we don't teach it as a second language. We teach it as a dominant language, which is very upsetting. There is no reason why Cubans can't talk their own language and still use English as a way of getting in and out of the system. Europeans have done that for years.

Robson: In the literature on bilingual education for Spanish-speaking, there is a clear division among experts in the academic journals on the advantages of bilingual education.

Casavantes: It is really not as complicated as it sounds. I have several friends who are specialists in bilingual education. If you called them in to set up a program in some specific place, they could set it up for you in three days. They understand the variables, they understand the structure, they go in and talk to the kids, and in no time at all they can tell you to use this curriculum material, use that curriculum material. This is one of the problems that this paper does not adapt itself to, the individualization of instruction. It makes great generalizations with which I agree, frankly, but it does not stress individualization.

Crawford: How do you implement it if you have a reservation where you only graduate one person from college every six years? That person is immediately picked up by the administration at $15,000 or $20,000 a year. You can't get him into any of the schools. You show me one person that is not Choctaw that speaks Choctaw. Where are you going to find them?

Simpkins: Why can't you develop the Choctaw to speak English to the point he can learn all the skills of a teacher and put that person into the situation?

(Break End of Day One)

Robson: We should move to the chicano concerns chapter and go back to the recommendations. Mr. Molins called together a group last night who reformulated some of the statements.

Molins: I got together with some of you yesterday afternoon and we made some changes on some of the headings on the paragraphs that we discussed earlier. I think it was in Miss Crawford's book that we wrote the things. Would you care to read them?

Casavantes: The lower the socioeconomic status of the person the greater the probability that he can speak only his native tongue. However, most minority people are found in what I call the ninth cell. Construct a matrix with social class beginning with middle-class, lower middle-class, lower, lower class according to the old criteria. On the other axis, put high English used, medium English used, low English used, then ninth cell. That's the one that worries us because that is the one where the kid does not have enough English to handle his work.

That ninth cell may contain at least one third of the population, and it may contain as much as half. This is one of the few things about which I am very ambivalent. If you emerge from an environment where nobody speaks anything but English and you have enough to get by, most people will learn to speak English pretty rapidly. I never spoke a word of English until I was eight. Between the ages of nine and ten, closer to eleven, I lived in El Paso in a barrio that spoke English only in school. But I learned enough English to get by. Then we moved to Tucson into what I guess you would call an integrated barrio where the chicano kids spoke almost all English and some Spanish. Within the year I was speaking perfect English. It was just a question of exposure.

With my father, it was 100 percent Spanish; my sister, 100 percent Spanish; the lady from Spain who was in charge of our boarding house, 100 percent Spanish. The peer influence was immense. You have to get into this milieu to develop English. It is unarguable that all people living in America should speak good English. They may speak anything else well, but they should also speak good English.

Mangum: We are just completing a research project at the university on the question the impact of nonstandard English on the hiring process. We have recorded speaking various ways, street English, our version of Appalachian whites from our isolated rural areas, and then had personnel directors of various companies listen to the tape and make judgments about the people and decide whether they would hire them on that basis. It comes through very clearly that to speak nonstandard English, the standard not necessarily in terms of the dictionary, but the standard in terms of the personnel director -- does militate against the person in getting hired.

Casavantes: There are a couple of things that I would like to comment on. On page 5-2 in the paragraph beginning with, "Chicano writers strongly insist on their diversity and they constitute one of the most heterogeneous ethnic groups ever to be studied by sociologists." First of all, they have been very badly studied by sociologists. I was embarrassed to think that psychologists had studied chicanos badly. It turns out that sociologists and anthropologists have done us one worse. Mexican-American psychologists have made fewer errors than sociologists and anthropologists. The net effect is that the anthropologists looking for the quaint and unique went to the barrio and found a bunch of people who were wearing the highest number of serapes and the old ladies with the black mantias across their heads. The houses were dilapidated, and they said, "Here we have now found the true Mexican-American," and proceeded to study and describe them, sometimes well--that is the danger. For example, there are very few things said in the study by Madsen about Mexican-Americans in south Texas which are not absolutely true. But taken into the general context, his statements are false. He confounded geography, social class, technology, and culture. It may well be that for purposes of educating people Madsen may be valuable. I think I mentioned to you yesterday a study in Pepique (ficticious name) by chicano psychologists who said, "I don't care where they come from, what their attributes are, and whence they come, we are going to find out who these kids are, and we are going to feed them what they need. We don't care where their deficiency comes from." He has done a remarkable job, and ultimately that may be our job.

The studies are very, very poor. The chicano scholar would be well advised to stop trying to find a typical or true, but seek rather to establish a range variation. That is an absolutely magnificent statement about studies except for one thing, nobody has done it. We would be well advised to stop trying to find a typical, that is true. Generalizations, extrapolated from the community in which a chicano happened to grow up or a part which sociologists or anthropologists have studied, can be particularly misleading.

Robson: The seeds of that statement are found in the symposium of the chicano scholars in the back of the book as well as in some of the writings that were reviewed in the literature. Now whether it is founded on sound research or whether it is the assertions of good chicano writers. . . .

Casavantes: I am afraid it is impressionistic. To say that chicanos have a different culture, a different lifestyle, different attitudes and values, that does not mean a thing to me until you can pin them down and say, "These are their characteristics."

Robson: Alright, should we move on or do you want some more comments?

Walser: I would like to ask a question concerning page 5-1. In view of the discussion I heard yesterday, I would like to have someone reflect to me, a black preferably, if he might or she might, on the second sentence of the lead paragraph.

Law: I don't separate the two. The fact that we share a culture and language has caused a problem in education which means that social and economic factors, as I see them, are my culture.

Mangum: I don't think we really cleared that up. It seems to me you still have to differentiate between internal and external factors: those kinds of things that are an inheritance of the group from which you come as opposed to those which are socio-economic. I am a white, Anglo-Saxon, rural Mormon. There are certain burdens that I carry in my attitude toward life and the world that I carry from my great grandparents. But then, also, there is the socioeconomic setting within which I have operated throughout my life and in which I now operate. It is really necessary to differentiate those for some purposes.

For instance, if you can generalize that American Indians in general reject a competitive culture in preference to a cooperative culture, that is separate from the question of the socioeconomic setting in which particular Indians operate. We must differentiate the two for some educational purposes. That is really what we are trying to do here. It is the way we have looked at culture and language. We are identifying as culture that inheritance that you bring into your socioeconomic setting, which is, in a sense, internal because that's the traditions with which you were born.

Robson: Let me add an additional point. I have a lot of sympathy for the argument that in the barrio and in the ghetto socioeconomic poverty becomes a culture. It is the culture. I think we have really got to spell out in the first chapter more about what we mean by "culture." We need to make the kind of distinctions Garth has suggested and come back to the basic kind of propositions you are suggesting. It seems to me the question then has to be addressed as to whether or not the culture of poverty is the same or different for Whites, Chicanos, Blacks, Indians, or whatever. You don't really find the concentration of urban poverty in the ghetto sense for Indians, except in a much smaller and lesser degree. There are concentrations in Chicago and Los Angeles, but relatively small. They are not in the magnitude of the barrios or the black ghettos. How would you distinguish between culture of poverty for Chicanos versus the culture of poverty for Blacks? I happen to think there is a strong difference between the urban and rural settings.

Casavantes: There was an article in Scientific America about six years ago where Oscar Lewis talked about the culture of poverty. The statement by Oscar Lewis in effect overstates the argument. Cohen and Hodges are methodologically more pure, and they actually "factor out" three dominant factors and then they do a "refactor" analysis and come out with eight or nine pure factors. Again it is a methodological way of approaching the problem.

Cohen and Hodges -- although they insist that they are not going to do any psychological interpreting of these variables -- then, like you people, proceed to do a beautiful job of showing how these simple attributes are very, very functional and how they work for the people in the culture.

Having read Cohen and Hodges carefully, you can go back and read Oscar Lewis who again is more impressionistic. Those two articles were both essentially urban. I know of no subsequent study that tries to make a distinction between urban lower class attributes and rural lower class attributes.

Walser: The part of that sentence that is giving me problems, and I don't understand, is still on page 5-1, the second sentence: It was "felt that the social and economic factors influencing their performance were so strong that any effort focused on dealing with the cultural and language factors was misplaced."

Robson: I think we should rewrite that. I think we would not say that it is misplaced. What I think we intend to say is that if you really want to contribure to the improved achievement in a learning setting, you ought to concentrate on the socioeconomic factors. Now if you identify those as a part of the culture, then obviously culture factors and socioeconomic factors become one and the same.

But I really think that one of the basic thrusts of this report from beginning to end is that you really have to concentrate in this country -- if you want to improve the quality of learning and achievement, on the needs of minority youngsters from a very poor background. To try to improve their survival and economic security, the whole range of social and economic factors that really influence them must be distinguished as independent from the culture. That is where we think the strongest emphasis ought to be placed: in improving the achivements of the disadvantaged, minority adults in manpower and vocational training.

Molins: I want to make one comment on that. What manpower really means is jobs that are economic not cultural. But to be able to get a job, you have to have some cultural relation to a setting in which you have to go out and get a job. In that sense, culture is significant. In terms of language specifically, obviously in many places you must speak English relatively well, and without much of an accent, to be able to compete with others for the same job. In the case of Cubans, again it has been particularly difficult to obtain training even, because all the training has only been available in English. It has been directed to those who can master English at least to the extent that they can communicate. The whole opportunity hinges on their ability to speak English, and there isn't, right now, any Spanish-language occupational or vocational training for manpower in Miami.

Mangum: This language thing has to be stated very strongly. But I am still concerned as to a practical recommendation on culture. These cultural things are used as an excuse in manpower training and vocational education. Officials say, "We can't do a good job of giving vocational education or manpower training to Indians because their cultural attributes prevent them from learning effectively." The important message in this report is "hogwash." If you can't do a good job of training American Indians, chicanos, and blacks, it is because you haven't put together the kind of training program that can train them. You can't go around saying that it's impossible to do anything with them...forget them. Economists are the greatest caveaters and hedgers and on-the-other-handers in the world, but you may be worse. By the time you get through with all the howevers, there may not be anything you are prepared to say flat out and straight out. We want to be sure that when we are through we have said something positive.

Casavantes: You can say something positive. The only caveats are in the fact of substantive knowledge of the specific cultural variables. That is the only thing that bothers me about this report. It acknowledges the existence of cultural differences and that these differences are very important in the training of the person, but nowhere are they outlined and empirically validated. Your paper is very well written, except you can't prove a thing.

Duffin: Let me just see if I can get into this paragraph. In 1967 in Philadelphia we had a tremendous course in English as a second language. We had difficulty placing many Puerto Ricans. The answer was very simple. It had nothing to do with training. Many had just come into the country. All we had to do was get one strong supervisor who spoke Spanish placed in each of those shops. Then they hired all of the trainees. So you see, training and the economic situation was not so much of a barrier.

To say that English is the dominant language is correct, except where does it get us in terms of can a guy do the job? So every time we wanted to make an inroad with Puerto Ricans, we had to convince the guy in the shop that all he really needed was a Spanish-speaking foreman, and we immediately had them hired.

Economics and the social atmosphere are part of the culture. They don't have to be barriers in every case, but they are barriers when we insist that all of the training for the jobs be at an English level. There is no reason, as the young lady was pointing out, that the Indian has to leave the reservation at all, if we could find in manpower a way to secure him so that he is content in making a living right there. That is my problem with manpower. We are trying to take people out of a certain environment and put them in others, when we could really do the job most likely right there.

Crawford: Don't you think we create misunderstandings when we say that? He was talking about the fact that many Spanish-speaking people were omitted from the programs because they speak no English at all. You say that no emphasis whatsoever should be focused on the language factor.

Mangum: That is not what this says. "Culture and language do not seem to be significant influences on the performance of the black trainees; therefore...." then it goes on and uses that as an example.

Man: "...performance or the innate ability to learn." There is a hell of a lot of difference between those two statements. See? It is not the performance; the ghetto or barrio experiences definitely lower aspirations and capacity to learn in the traditional conditions.

Simpkin: Maybe rather than the "capacity" or "potential", the "desire" to learn.

Duffin: I firmly believe that if a chicano was being trained in his native language and he was also introduced to English, and the instructor was bilingual, and they were all moving together, you would achieve a greater deal of success. Manpower unfortunately doesn't deal with that problem because we are in such a hurry to get the guy a job. I don't think it takes any more time. I do think you do have to address yourself to those cultural things so that I can say, "You are achieving. We are moving you ahead in your language."

Manpower has problems because it is a hasty thing. The job market opens up, let's get a guy ready to be a machine tool operator, and yet we miss all of those cultural and social things that really have him hung up. Somewhere along the line we have got to pick that up if it means that we have got to fund it so that the guy comes in once or twice a week, and we continue that process.

Simpkins: I think what we are addressing here are the existing barriers with regard to the culture of the populations we are speaking of. In other words, back to the traditional again. We all have firm in our minds that the traditional approaches to education and employment are not practical for the existing cultural situation. What I suggested yesterday in an attempt to answer Leroy's question was that we suggest for policy purposes that teachers and instructors for manpower and vocational education be trained from the population that we are concerned with, to work with those populations of students so that the instructors themselves have a bilingual capacity. I have found that in research for this, both in interviews and in literature, where this was the case, more rapid learning takes place.

Canchola: Efforts are being made in manpower to train instructors and make them aware of differences. They have been very successful. Some of the instructors are chicano, some are black, and some are Indian. I am real proud of the AMIDS [Area Manpower Institutes for Development of Staff] program and what they are trying to do, because it has worked in Arizona in getting those awarenesses out.

Art Hernandez: We have been discussing the content for the last day or day and a half as if there was nothing wrong with the process. I would like to talk about the process itself before we get to the content. The motive behind this whole thing as far as your office is concerned, Leroy, as I understand it, is getting research findings that are going to help you establish some sort of policy and improve the delivery system of manpower programs. Right? But you could only do that if the research is good or valid. If it is invalid, then you have got a lot of junk to look at. So far the impression I get is that you are not sure that you have got something. The motive of the research corporation may be considerably different, since it was paid.

One thing I saw here was a very good political process of lumping the three minorities together to make it more meaningful. Whereas if you had to deal with each one separately, you would have quite a problem. I don't quarrel with the goal. I think it is a reasonably good goal. The other goal was to identify the specific variables that affect vocational aspirations and the level of performance. That again is a very good goal, but I didn't see too much there.

Now let's start with the report itself. Let's start over where we talk about the basic assumptions you are going to be working with. The definitions, for example, on page 1-3. The definition of culture. Since the whole report turns on what you define as culture, I simply took a dictionary and looked it up and found a much more comprehensive and much more thorough description of culture than what you use here.

It seems that in the discussion yesterday people were referring to that weakness. So right off, I think the definition is poor. Then you get to page 1-4 and started discussing the theoretical orientation of the study. At this point, as a scholar, I expected a discussion of cultural theory, but there is nothing there. For example, there are some theories which say that culture changes when it is technology that changes. Technology is changing now all over. What is happening to culture? There is nothing in there about that, so my conclusion up to that page is that there is a very low level of theoretical sophistication in this report.

Now I go into methodology on page 3-3. This is the actual design of the study. How you are going to go about it. What it amounts to is a field study and consists of a survey of the literature, a questionnaire, and some interviews. When I looked at your review of the literature, I found you listed eleven items; and somewhere in there, I found a few more. So I would say there are eleven to fifteen items, which I would not call an exhaustive review of the literature by any means.

Someone explained that there were other books reviewed, but they were not included here. If that is the case, then to maintain the integrity of the report, you should publish those things separately. There is no reason why you couldn't have a volume 2 and list everything you went through. I have a very cynical view of some of these things, and they would be more meaningful to me if that was an annotated bibliography rather than just a listing of books. The value to scholars of that kind of thing is that unpublished manuscripts are difficult to find in libraries. Most of that stuff is easy to find, so your survey of the literature does not really contribute that much. At least it doesn't to me.

Then I looked at the questionnaires -- about 72 -- and the number of people were actually involved came to thirteen chicanos. It is pretty hard to say the sample was valid. Consequently, the conclusion I have up to that page is that this methodology is very loose. Consequently, how can I deal with the contents? I can see that the contents are going to be more guesses than valid findings. If I were to go a little further into the study I could begin to find other weaknesses, little by little. I thought to myself, "Alright. If I were associated with this report, could I say here is a valid piece of stuff that we are very proud of?" I don't think it would win any awards. Secondly, could I take it to the scholars of the chicano problem and say, "Here is a report that will contribute to your inquiries." No, I don't think it would do that either. I don't think it extends our understanding or our knowledge of chicanos. As research? I don't think it does that either.

Most of the report is appendices. The report itself is very small. It looks impressive. The first thing I did was weigh it and ask myself, do I really want to read all of this.

Don't misunderstand my motives. I didn't come 2,500 miles to tear something apart. This is always easy to do. It is much harder to build something up. If this report were well done, would it contribute something? Probably not because the real game here is political. You can probably get all the research you want to support some position. Ultimately it is how you handle yourself politically.

What about the recommendations? The number one recommendation that was made all day yesterday, on which we all agree, is self-determination. Let us have the money and let us get to deal with the cultural problems, and that deals with research. I could do a lot with the amount spent on this study. I wouldn't put it in research. I think there is enough research going on. I would put it where it would really do some good.

Some of the stuff is contradictory. Notice that all of those recommendations deal with low-level processes. They don't really deal with politics. They deal with materials. The first recommendation, to me, would be to give the money to the people that are dealing with the problems. I am surprised that people are letting that go by.

Man: Program and curriculum developers should shift their efforts away from adapting programs and materials to the cultural characteristics of the nondominant populations.

There is this whole process here of separating culture from language. You cannot do that. Language is the medium of culture.

Probably in summary I would say the methodology of the report is so weak that I don't even want to deal with the content. If I had to make a recommendation, I would say, "Give us the money, don't give it to somebody else." The research on chicanos started very early, and we still have a body of knowledge that is very weak. I think we could get a lot more by simply asking, "What is the culture now? What is status of the language now?"

I can walk into classrooms in east Los Angeles and walk up and down the classroom and hear the stomachs of kids growling. They say there are plenty of food stamps. But the bureaucratic red tape for getting food stamps is fantastic. My neighbor who is a steel salesman and earns around $20,000 a year or more -- his children are on food stamps. They are in college. They are on food stamps because they have declared themselves unemployed. They get food stamps and they live in their pads, and they have a great time. So the poor still have problems. One of the problems is that they don't know how to function politically over here as a power.

With all due respect to my friends, my Indian friends, my black friends, and chicanos who worked on this, I would conclude that you were used. The more often we provide information, the more often we get used. I have hesitations about the report. I wouldn't be associated with it. It is a damn poor report. Having said that, I would like to be sure I get paid.

Mangum: The one thing that we ought to be clear about is that we are not trying to shift any responsibility to you people. We are asking you to say what you think. The ultimate report, after all, is our responsibility. We get advice from you people and several of you have said you don't want your name on the report. Of course, our responsibility will ultimately be to decide from what we have heard, what to say to Leroy in the final report. The taxpayers of the United States paid us for doing the job, and they ought to blame us for anything or credit us for it, if there is any credit to be had.

It seems to me that it is vital that we get to this question of Reva and Art. Remember that we are talking about vocational education and manpower. The vital question is: "If you were giving some advice to people who were running a Skills Center somewhere as to where they ought to put their scarce time and other resources for these groups of people, would you put your time, effort, and resources into developing materials and training materials directed toward cultural attributes (like some of the ones we have talked about here), or would you rather say we had better put our efforts into training staff to understand the culture, or to efforts that relate to some of the socioeconomic factors that Ken was talking about?

Crawford: You talk as if we either have to totally ignore one and accentuate the other or vice versa. That is not so. Just like you were talking about in this recommendation, to shift efforts away from adapting programs and materials to cultural services. I don't think there is anybody that is going to say that there are enough materials, especially for literacy and language training, which are adapted to minority groups. It does not mean that you have got to have the preponderance of all your efforts concentrated on cultural or bilingual types of things. But it doesn't mean that you have to say that nobody should have anything to do with it.

Hernandez: You missed my fundamental objective. I wouldn't go into any of these things because that is playing the same old ball game. As the man said, I am interested in being on the board of directors. The fundamental recommendation I would make is to give that money to those people who have problems. Give it to the group of Indians to do their own research. Give it to a group of chicanos that are interested in doing some research. We may come up with the same kinds of conclusions, but I rather suspect that if you give it to us, we would have a different focus.

Smith: The point is, Art, what would you do with the programs that now exist? That is where the focus of this report is. Not on whether or not money has been given to Olympus Research to do another research study. The question is, given the ongoing programs that are now there, where would you see people putting their emphasis in those programs now? Or would you scrap those programs?

Hernandez: He gave you a very good clue from Philadelphia. Sometimes you can get people placed simply by training supervisors. I would say, "Alright. Put some money into a program to train Indian supervisors, bilingual supervisors." But you missed the point of the whole discussion -- in Indian communities it is a different world, a different way of thinking. If you put money in their hands, they might say, "No, we don't want to get into that economic race that you are talking about. We have a different kind of world."

I must say that having been up here in Washington a number of times to review proposals, as far as the Indian populations are concerned, it is still a patronage kind of system. The only way to change that kind of system is to give the resources to the Indians. Let them make their own self-determination. Now the same thing with the blacks. Whenever that argument comes up in these rooms, they always say they are not qualified. They are not qualified to do this kind of research. I am just as qualified to waste money as anyone.

Mangum: All the recommendations that you are making, Art, and the rest of you, are really one recommendation-- that you would give the groups the funds as a manpower revenue-sharing program? Instead of giving it to the states and cities, give it to representatives of the various ethnic and racial groups, and let them decide what to do with it, whether to train, etc.?

Hernandez: First let them have the decision-making power regarding the funds. That is my number-one recommendation. The second one will actually follow from the first. It is up to them as to what they want to do with it.

Mangum: So in effect, it is the manpower revenue-sharing approach, instead of putting it through political jurisdictions to the target groups as such.

Canchola: The records prove that at the San Carlos Skills Center this was very true, and again I am going to blow my own trumpet. The three years we were there, more was done with $300,000 than has been done for so many adults in the San Carlos area. This was because of the atmosphere and the attitude expressed by the majority of the staff with staff training from AMIDS. Politics took that money away from us this past year. The only reason we [illegible]nued last year was because we made so much noise from the Indian community that Goldwater got into the picture. But they took it away again. I think it should be done that way -- given to the people in the local area.

Mangum: It seems to me that is a very useful recommendation. Backed up by the OIC experience in places where there are concentrations of people, so that all the target group is relatively homogeneous. The Los Angeles Skills Center, and a variety of places where they do tend to have most of the population of a particular ethnic racial group, seems to work very well.

Hailes: I think we have to bear in mind the political implications involved in the whole setup. It is true that OIC for the first year received about $ 32 million. We did a good job, second to none in the country. Our program in Washington, and I would imagine in Philadelphia and New York, stood out as the best manpower programs in the nation. We were doing a good job. We thought we were helping folks. We placed thousands of people in millions of jobs. In Washington alone we added over $15 million to the economy in three years. The next year came around and they cut us $26 million. Then they cut us $22 million. Then they cut us out altogether. Come August 15, we are through.

As far as giving the money to us is concerned, we have got to go the whole route. Let the people decide whom to train, whom we want to place, and how we are going to do it. We won't have any control over the situation now. So we just take our chances. We thought we were doing a pretty good job. I know in Washington we did. We turned out 836 graduates June 10, and we have placed 93 percent of them making over $5,260 a year. Our retention rate would be over 87 percent over a year. I think that is a pretty good record. We can't get the money to do it.

Duffin: Just because we represent OIC, we are not doing everything right. We have centers that obviously don't do as well as Philadelphia and maybe New York.

You recommend a review of the existing ESL material. Who is supposed to review the ESL material? Maybe it might be that all the chicanos review all ESL material, and all the blacks. You should have stepped up to the point and recognized the fact that no matter what we do, we are losing the battle on the manpower front because of the policies. We were doing a good job and they took the bread and all that other jazz.

I am saying that if you are going to recommend something, I like to get right to the nuts and bolts of it. If a guy is allowed not to review the ESL material, if he is allowed to hire incompetent instructors (manpower is loaded with incompetent instructors and counselors who think they are do-gooders and have fallen out of the sieve in the school system), if you are going to do something and recommend something, as I see it, let's get to the heart of what's really wrong with manpower.

One of the things that you found was that most of the programs were administered very poorly in most cases. If we have the money, we at least could make the same mistakes. Maybe not as badly, but we could make some of the same mistakes. And I think that we would fare better. I want to deal with the recommendations, to upgrade them to the level I think they ought to go. The heart of the matter is that when you say "a review of existing ESL material to determine which are most useful" means very little to me if you don't put some muscle in there.

Casavantes: These two people were talking of the most obvious thing of this entire conference. It was so obvious that I hadn't caught it. If this report had been written correctly and appropriately, the conclusion that would have inevitably arisen is this conclusion: You are saying, "What are the attributes of Mexican-Americans? Let's put them down on paper."

A second ago I said to you, when I was giving you the literature, that it really doesn't make any difference if you get a chicano in there to do the training, he will know the attributes. He doesn't have to be taught. In other words, give the Navajos their money. I suspect that they will do at least as good a job and probably a better job than is being done now. I will guarantee that they will only do a poor job one time, and after that the other Navajos will say, "Shape up, Fred." This gets this thing on the road where it is supposed to be. I figure we ought to fall on our faces on our own, rather than have somebody else fall on our faces for us. I think we will fall on our faces one time and then we will learn.

The other thing you said is that the whole process is political. Let me change this thing so completely around that you would normally think that this had nothing to do with it. Except that it has everything to do with it. I work for the Drug Abuse Council, and we have come up with almost no generalizations about drugs and drug abuse except one -- drugs tend to be legal or illegal. The two most dangerous drugs in the world are tobacco and alcohol.

There is one chicano serving life in Texas for smoking a joint. The whole drug scene is a political bag. They use politicians to funnel money and professional drug-professionals. I am one of them right now. I am a professional Drug Abuse Council exploiter in that I am ripping off money from somebody else in order to try to find out what the whole scene is. I mean it is political. Who is going to have power to determine what drugs are dangerous and what drugs are not? Translate that sentence.

We are not going to have power over what programs are valuable and what programs are not. By the way, who runs the Drug Abuse Council? Sixty percent of the people who are hung up on drugs are minority people. They have one black and one chicano on a thirteen or fourteen-man board. Don't you see what we are trying to tell you?

Crawford: If we decide that every particular group should be deciding their own group needs. . . what that really means is, we all have very different needs and unless you list the needs for eighteen different black groups and needs for every Indian tribe and needs for every other group, it is going to get kind of difficult. The only other thing we can do is say, "Give the money to develop the materials and develop the staff training to the particular group," unless you want to sit down here and go through every group and decide what their needs are arbitrarily through the people that represent the groups here. I can tell you our needs are different from the needs of others. There are some differences in some northern black needs and some southern black needs, but it is not just geographic.

Mangum: I think we are inclined to be sympathetic to this approach. But the thing we have to decide now is if this is the only thing we have to say. Chapter 9 is to have but one sentence. "Give the money to minority groups." Would you like to see anything else or is that the end of the advice?

Hernandez: The more you add, the more you try to legitimatize the report. You cannot justify the stuff in terms of a research report. Because even to the coding process on page 3-18, you admit yourselves that you goofed on the coding. Consequently, from the very first when the questionnaires started coming in you didn't set up your questionnaires in such a way that you could relate sex or age to particular findings.

The thing was bad all the way through. Sure I can give you a lot of recommendations based on my experience, but you are the guy who has got the money. You are the guys who have to do the work of doing these kinds of things.

Mangum: We are not here to shift any of the responsibility, and we have asked for your advice. If that is your advice, fine. When you have given us all you want to give us, we will just adjourn.

Casavantes: I would only add that I am really in great sympathy with this thing because I have seen it work, and I have seen it work very well. Notice incidently that it is what I mentioned yesterday as basically a John Bircher position. We said we would rather do it ourselves. Once you put in recommendation number one, the main thrust of our recommendation is simply: Give the money to the people who will be actually doing the work. Then they will take a set of recommendations that you have outlined here and will themselves work out the details for Denver, Colorado; for Albuquerque, for Philadelphia, for Newark, whatever. They too will come up with these recommendations. Fund the people who are actually going to be involved in the work projects themselves. Second, let them develop guidelines which parallel the outline given in Chapter 9. Let them develop items specifically related to each one of these.

Mario Molins: I think we have to be more careful than that. There are bureaucracies at the local level that we have to deal with. You can't say from the national level, "Let the locals make the decisions," when the locals may be totally inoperative in terms of the bureaucracy at the local level.

Casavantes: This is one of the subtle strategies of the Nixon Administration, which we have been to be an extraordinarily racist organization. There has not been one step forward since this Administration took office. There have been some regressions despite allegations to the contrary. If there have been advances, it is because minority people themselves make extraordinary efforts in this demand.

We have nagged the National Institute of Mental Health for two years to increase the number of chicanos on their staff. It is still 2 percent. I myself have, on video tape, said to the National Institute of Health Director, "Will you send out a memorandum to all your initial review groups that unless there is an affirmative action plan, any proposal will be immediately returned." He said, "No. I won't do that." So this is the political process of no mean dimension. So we got mad and formed the Coalition of Spanish-Speaking Mental Health Organization. We are doing the thing ourselves. We are not going to hassel with the bureaucracy.

Robson: I think it is not quite that black and white on this particular issue. Turn the question around and ask, "What is the role of the dominant culture in relationship to the services for the nondominant culture?" There is no legitimate role. I think you have interesting problems of political social theory for the nation and the society in which you are involved. If you really want to change the delivery system and the institution, you are in fact going to deal with those administrators, teachers, and instructors. That is where 90 percent of the money is right now. That is where 90 percent of the services are. You can make a recommendation to give the money to minority groups to serve minority groups, and you will end up with a relatively small proportion of the money and probably in second-class facilities.

I was involved at the Washington level when the first OIC was funded for Reverend Sullivan in 1967. I sat in that meeting in the Department of Labor as Executive Director of the President's Committee on Manpower and took a hell of a lot of flak when that year we put in some $25 million to start that program. Every place we went to in the cities except Philadelphia, we took all kinds of hell from the mayors and the power structures in those communities. I got threatened in a couple of communities. One of the most unpleasant afternoons I ever spent was in Phoenix, Arizona, because of the attempt to set up a OIC program there.

So I think you have got a lot of interesting problems in terms of what it is you are really trying to change and where progress can be made, given the practical realities of our system. What this report is trying to say, which I think is still the number-one recommendation and number-one important problem, is -- we have got to change the dominant culture's attidues, perceptions, and response to the non-dominant population in this country. Every major piece of research and writing that I know of backs up that basic proposition.

Crawford: People have been saying that for a long, long time now, and it hasn't done much good because you haven't seen any action. . . .

Robson: Oh, I think we are making progress in the country. I think you would have a hard time arguing. . . .

Lady: The action has been taken through force. It is through things like this which you force.

Hernandez: That is very nice. I think if I were sitting in a Senate hearing my first question to you would be, "How do I do it?" I responded to you by saying the first step is to put the resources into the hands of the people who are concerned with that problem. Now the answer that always comes back with that kind of an approach is: "You guys are not ready yet to handle those kinds of funds. You don't know what to do with them."

Robson: I don't think that is the answer. That is not the answer I hear being given in this country. The answer is now, "we are going to give the money to elected officials"; i.e., governors, mayors, and county commissioners. I think that means OIC is going to get less money, not more. I think, if I understood what Mario was saying, that minority groups in this country have and probably will turn out to have a much better record of getting funding out of federal agencies than they will out of the local power structure. Despite the treaties with Indian tribes, and we are still fighting about that, what is the status of the Navajo nation which falls into four states' sovereign power? The facts of the matter are that in our governmental system at the federal, regional, state, and local level, there is a movement toward funneling all of the money and all of the programs through the constituted units of constitutional government. By definition, minorities do not control those. . . only when they become majorities.

Crawford: There is a point though. Indian reservations have, with almost every agency, gone around the state and dealt directly with the federal agencies, directly with HEW, directly with OEO. They have not gone through the state government. And minority groups do not necessarily have to go through them either, if we can put some kind of input into things like this to show that agencies can work directly with minority groups.

Casavantes: This is a racist federal government and we can prove that, too, because we have a massive study of it. As racist as it is, the individual states are more racist because they have got more specific targets. Through the National Institute of Mental Health we could fund to a tiny, little Oriental woman in Sacramento who wanted to do a study of old people, how they congregated, and how they utilized park space because they wanted to take this part out and build a high-rise. She said this constituted the only recreation that these old people had. We gave her a little, tiny thing like $12,000. That woman wouldn't have got to first base with the mayor of that city. In this sense, revenue sharing is a subtle racist move.

Mangum: It seems to me that we have got our meeting bogged down. Art has given us some criticisms, probably valid, of the report. We are not interested in being defensive about the report. It is written, the money has been spent. The question I lay before you is this: Is there anything else (in the few minutes left that we have together) that you can give us as help on the report? Ultimately, it is going to be our responsibility to decide what we put down to give to Leroy, and his responsibility to accept it or throw it back to us. We would like to get all the contributions we can get from you. You have been tremendously positive to this point. These things you are saying right now are very positive. Now the question is: Are there more things that could be said in another half hour?

Duffin: There was no discussion about recommendations for bilingual instructors. I feel very strongly that you must have found out that bilingual instructors fare better than English-speaking teachers who can't understand kids during the lunch break.

In terms of the survey, the blacks in the South in a manpower program have a different culture from the blacks in the urban society. Was that reflected in it? I don't know about the chicano and the Indian or the Appalachian white. But I have got to believe that if you coupled all of those together, there has got to be some misinformation in it.

Casavantes: Excuse me. Wouldn't you agree with me that if there was a little pocket of unemployed blacks on the outskirts of Tusculoosa, Alabama, those people would be the best people to write the proposal and run the program?

Duffin: You can take self-determination a long way. I am not saying that every white or that every chicano or every Indian or every black can participate at a certain level in administering programs. I do believe that somewhere along the line as it is developed, they can surely make some input as to what they want to do, but I am not hung up over it. A black in Tuscaloosa may not know all the parts to writing a proposal, but he could surely make some input that would be relevant and, if incorporated, it would make it meaningful.

However, let's face the fact that people with the Ph.D.'s and the biggest muscle are those who write the proposals. Until they find another way to disburse grants, studies are going to be written by someone, so why not Olympus? I think we have made our inputs to their report, and they will be cognizant of it. I don't think the report will hurt because it does say some worthwhile things. I think our obligation here is to make known where we don't agree with it and where we do agree with it, and be on record.

The answer basically to your question is that I don't think the blacks in Tuscaloosa can really get the program together. I think they can make the input. As they are trained they will be much more proficient at it. What I am getting at, administratively, is that I would rather see a guy come down who is interested in the blacks of Tuscaloosa; you know, the ordinary Joe who doesn't know everything. I am tired of seeing a guy come in that knows everything about everything, and he is saying that this is what is good for the blacks. Just listen. If some of the people we hire could just be good listeners. I know I have a problem with black administrators who think they know everything for blacks. We don't.

One of the things that you did not address yourselves to is the referral of the people to the program. Does a guy really want to be in the program? The employment people refer people into the training program, but does that guy really want that job? I think that the referral mechanism should have been one of the things that would have helped you decide whether some of the information was valid.

I used to say to the trainees, when I saw a lady who needed two chairs to sit on, who wanted to be a secretary, "When you see a receptionist in one of these white offices, she is always a fox. She might be dumber than hell, but she always looks good. There are about ten of you behind her doing all the work. If you can be satisfied with good typing skills or some other kind of skills, okay. Don't try to be a flashy secretary out front, because you are not going to be that. They are not going to hire you. No matter what kind of skills, you are just not going to make GE's front office or GM's front office or some of the federal front offices."

Hernandez: I am interested in changing that.

Duffin: Well you had better work on a lot of other people then. You ought to look at the role of the employment service people in terms of the referral mechanism, because to my way of thinking, the answers you got were a result of the people that were recruited in manpower training programs. I don't know if they were the people that should have been there.

You must have found out something about the teachers and if they needed additional training. You had to do something like that. I was a former teacher and worked in administration a little bit. You know right away whether that teacher can get off the mark. You have to hire research people, to my way of thinking, to be able to say, "That's my kind of teacher." You must have found out whether a teacher in those manpower programs can get off the mark.

Are the counselors on the ball? I have walked up to counseling programs where the counselor couldn't even write in the phone numbers. You know they have a problem in counseling. Did you find anything about counseling to make the information valid?

The same way with administrators. Did the administrators exude the kind of esprit-de-corps motivation that made that shop what it should be? If it didn't, every answer that you have got, to my way of thinking, is going to be negative. If the administrator is lousy, everybody in that program is lousy. The instructor is saying, "All the trainees are lousy. I hate to come to work." Did you find that in terms of the administrator?

I guess this is the last thing I have to say. A concrete analysis of the actual obstacles in the employment of trainess should be undertaken and it should have a twofold focus. Do we know anything about the former trainees who went through the program and how the cultural and linguistic barriers affected them? We only talked to the people in the program. We didn't talk to anybody outside. On the one hand, a study should assess the obstacles that resulted from the trainees' own experiences, such as the level of education. Did you really match up what the guy said about the trainee and what was really in the folder of the trainee? Maybe you didn't have the time.

There is a very wide chasm between what the instructor thinks about the trainee and what the counselor thinks about the trainee. Do they come together in what we call in OIC a "disposition conference"? Are there disposition conferences in manpower programs so that what the instructor, counselor, and administrator are saying is valid about that same trainee. Maybe you should have had all three in the room at the same time. In 8b [page 9-6] you say: "Open-ended materials should be developed for use by minority trainees, with a focus on improving the self-image of trainees." I am trying to figure out what open-ended materials are and why they need to be developed for self-image.

Mangum: I wish I knew what that sentence means myself.

Duffin: Career education materials should be developed and used as part of the orientation of every trainee. It is important that a trainee have a clear understanding of the full range of occupational choices available to him. I think a lot of the material that you gathered has some relevance to career education. What is happening in manpower? Do the counselors, instructors, and administrators see this as career? Everything that you said in the study came across to me as stopgap. I think you treated language and culture as kind of a stopgap. I believe if you work on the culture, the language, and the career educational piece or the manpower piece, then we are moving the guy toward the mainstream society.

It is also recommended that the training cycle be modified to allow time for the inclusion of this remedial work in a training program. I guess what I am saying to Leroy is, if you don't make that mandatory when you give grants out, along with the proper recruitment, counseling, and training methods, I think you will lose the ball game because manpower will always be stopgap in the minds of everybody.

I don't see manpower as stopgap. Like the educational process, it is full time, and a guy should be able to come back and get recycled. But the feds have got to make it mandatory that when you are talking about dealing with an individual, it has got to be what we call a "whole man" concept. It can't be just around language and culture. It has got to be around everything that makes that guy a halfway decent trainee.

Walser: Ken, you are hitting on something that I hit on the very first day. In the total educational procedures and processes that are taking place in this country and manpower, there are certain areas in which we are doing pretty well. Performance in certain skill areas is pretty good, but it is not taking into account some of the other aspects of the human being in the manpower programs. Two of those aspects were causing a lot of controversy and lack of direction, and no movement was taking place because there was no information available which the policy makers themselves could use and which were applicable to that whole man. It is easy to say "the whole man," but it is hard to define it.

This is part of the thing that Ed has been talking about the past two days. The intent of this was to begin to open up the dialogue on what the role of culture and language in the educational process of manpower should or should not be.

Having said that, then you come back to the other recommendations that have been coming in here. I haven't heard a recommendation yet that I didn't think was good. Some of them, I think, are excellent. Some of them I've got to understand a little better. The point of this intent was to open up the dialogue into the discussion of the whole man. That was what the intent was when we began to work on this concept. Now whether or not the concept has been translated into implementations and actions is the point.

Casavantes: Tell us what you can hope to do with the recommendations because I leave these meetings very frustrated most of the time without hearing from the people who are in effect going to implement these recommendations.

Duffin: Let me make my last recommendation. As opposed to a "post," we ought to have a "pre" on RFP's or a session after RFP but before the project work statement is finished. All these gentlemen have the greatest integrity, I am not questioning that.

Crawford: Do you know whether the trainees were actually reflective of the minority groups that they were representing? Or were they either so far below or so far above the national educational level of their people that this whole thing is a bunch of mishmash and doesn't mean anything.

Mangum: The general tendency will be for them to be somewhat above the norm for their socioeconomic class. It will depend on the particular occupation in which the trainee occurs. There are certain occupations to which, as Ken implied, the employment service would only refer people who had high school diplomas. To some other occupational training they would refer less educated people. In general, in MDTA, it is about eleventh grade.

Crawford: The reason I am saying it is that I know of at least two institutions for Indians where all the students are going to be high school graduates. That is terribly misleading.

Molins: I have a couple of specific recommendations. I would like to go into very short comments after the recommendations. Specifically, I would like to make one recommendation that there be efforts to ensure that there will indeed by bilingual, bicultural administrative staffs in local organizations that are going to deal with the programs or grants. Then it has got to be specified that they have got to be there at the planning level, at the decision-making level, at the operating level.

Hailes: I would not necessarily want a policy to come out that required me to have a bilingual teacher by the way of Spanish-speaking people. . . .

Molins: Allow me. That is what I am getting at. In fact, that is just what I was getting ready to say on page 9-5, item f: "An overall framework. . . ." I would substitute the word "bicultural" for "multicultural" so that no one group or two groups are favored or dominant. Because they have to be flexible to whatever it is the particular minority in that program is about. Then I want to go to general kinds of things, like you have to be specific as to who is going to be given the authority and charged with the responsibility of carrying out the recommendations. Otherwise it will be no go.

Molins: If I may, I would like to add some comments. I don't know if they should be an addendum to this entire Conference or if you want to include them as the next paragraph of the chicano concerns. Cubans are a very urban kind of minority, and so they have some attributes that are the same as the urban chicanos and urban Puerto Ricans. But some are different. They have a high level of self-esteem, and they don't want to be assimilated into the dominant American culture. And yet they don't want continued deprivation and discrimination. They must either suffer because of their culture or abandon it. Well I am sure nobody wants that to happen to them. Certainly that is a fact with Cubans. Cubans may even understand what is expected of them in their new homeland. But at the same time, they are prevented from reaching the expectations about them anyway because of the cultural barriers.

Casavantes: It is absolutely possible for a person to be bilingual and bicultural. In other words, I can be a chicano. . . I can be an American. . . I can switch rolls when the circumstances call for it. I am not in any sense selling out. It simply means that under certain circumstances, I can exercise certain attributes and qualities. . . sing Mexican songs, so to speak, and sing American songs.

You were raised Cuban. I was raised in Mexico, and nobody looked down on me until I came to the United States. I then found myself inferior. You figure that out. The point is that there is no conflict between being bilingual and bicultural. Other groups have solved this. I think Italians have done a good job. I think Jews have done a good job of being both Jewish and American. The Italians have done a good job at being Italian and American.

Molins: But it requires a very positive kind of activity to maintain that kind of value system, biculturalism.

Further, I have a general kind of comment. Please don't misunderstand because I come here very openly and I have no hidden agendas, and I want to get that on the record. As I said yesterday, Cubans have just been discovered last year in Dade County. At the national level, maybe Cubans have not been discovered yet. They are not equivalent of the Puerto Ricans' forum or Operation SER for the Cuban population. The recognition that Cubans have received at the national level, in my opinion, is negative. It has been in a very political kind of way. They have been exploited even at the political level and have been used only when it is more to the benefit of the grantor than it is to the Cuban grantee. The Cubans ought to be included in any kind of study or considerations of the Spanish-speaking. Contrary to popular belief they don't all water ski in Biscayne Bay.

In specific terms I have some recommendations. These come in two parts: For the academic school systems, there is a definite need to continue and strengthen English as a second language. However, ESL should be offered but only as a preface to the regular English that all kids have to take in the high schools, not given a second-rate look at grammar and literature. The second part of that is a specific program instituted for Spanish-speaking, "native" speakers to keep alive their positive values of their native culture. None of these programs, as they exist today, is nearly adequate in any kind of way.

Now in terms of manpower vocational training, someone has got to seek a balance in terms of the basic requirements for jobs. For example, you can train a mechanic in the technical skills to be a mechanic and handle tools without the necessity to have the individual know English as a prerequisite, because there are mechanical vocational courses in Mexico, Argentina, and Cuba. They are all conducted in Spanish. And these people are just as good mechanics, believe it or not. Don't require that English language ability be a prerequisite to get into training programs, but that the English language training be parallel and additional to the technical training.

There is also a dire need for improved occupational training methods. Vocational educational programs for Spanish-speaking is a very crucial need today. Finally, I would like to say that all these programs and all these comments and all these recommendations ought to do one thing: to allow all minority groups to contribute their own worth to their own culture and their values, while contributing to the general overall culture and maintaining their positive self-image. There has got to be a way where you don't have to give up being Cuban, chicano, Choctaw, or Navajo to get on the merry-go-round, as it were.

Casavantes: I have one recommendation that is very broad. I won't expand on this because if you begin to expand on it, you can go into an extremely long harangue, and it also gets pretty technical. That is that when and if psychological test instruments are used, these test instruments be demonstrated to be valid instruments for that group. Otherwise they are not to be used. I have found, as a matter of fact, that talking to people is at least as good, if not better, than the psychological test instruments. The counseling process itself is an integral part. It should be given ample time in any training program. Again I would like to have Leroy respond to this because I would like to hear what he has to say about it. What will happen to the recommendations?

Walser: The regular procedure for any report is for the contractor to make a presentation to the entire division or to those persons who are in the division to listen to it. Afterwards, it is the responsibility of the project officer (which I happen to be in this one) to write down either to accept it or reject it, or have it modified. That is the mechanical procedure to go through in this thing. Then the contractor gets clearance with the grants and contracts office, which is a different set of people from myself.

We have, as I indicated to you, a network of staff development activities across the entire nation. It is called Area Manpower Institutes for the Development of Staff (AMIDS). They will be one of the first to receive the report. It will go across the entire United States in our own built-in dissemination mechanism. If it has enough valid content to it, it will be forwarded to the highest level of HEW. Whatever they do with it is their business. There is no way a project officer is going to do anything except pen the letter my boss will sign to transmit the thing on to the system. That is the realities of the way we work. Each one of you will get a copy to do with as you please.

Ed, without going into the details, there is a policy group within the division that meets periodically -- at least once a week -- on items of validity and significance that have to do with the writing down of the areas of critical need for attention. I can guarantee you this much, as long as I am in the office, this will be the subject of at least one of those policy meetings where it begins to build into those concerns. From this I would hope that local administrators and state administrators would read into this to see whether or not they are fitting into some of the categories or recommendations. One of the primary problems is to use this report as a vehicle to validate the subject area as a topic of conversation. It has been ignored for so long.

Coming from the background I came from, a Mexican citizen born and raised in Mexico of American parents and therefore am Mexican-American, I was very surprised when I got into national office that people didn't understand people who were culturally distinct, not different, culturally distinct, unique, had a unique set of experiences to work with. The United States did not all of a sudden drop off west of the Mississippi.

So I hope that answers it, because that is as much as the report can really get to work with. I hope that the individuals that are around this table, president of a junior college, for instance, would find this useful in some of the activities -- maybe staff development plans -- for his own college.

Robson: Any other comments? If not, I think there is just no way we can summarize what has gone on in a day and a half and do it adequately. It is all on tape. We do appreciate your contributions. I am sure you can appreciate that not all of your comments have been comforting and warming and reassuring. We are convinced that we probably have to go back and do some additional work now in light of what you have told us. And we will summarize the discussion and put that in the report.

The report itself will be changed to accommodate your counsel and your advice on some of these problems. In the final analysis, obviously, the contract between Olympus Research Corporation and the Office of Manpower Development and Training places the responsibility on us for the report. We would encourage each of you to get your written comments to us at the earliest point and time.

We thank Leroy, and we thank each of you for your contribution and your participation. I hope we have occasion to sit down together again to continue a dialogue on this subject matter.

Walser: I would just like to express my appreciation for the excellent work. Sometimes we are just a little bit hesitant to bring some individuals in because we feel that maybe they will just sit and listen and not contribute. This has been a very good meeting, and I appreciate it.

Dr. Howard Matthews, Director of Manpower Development and Training, for whom I have a great deal of respect, has a statement he uses once in a while. I don't know if he thought it up, but if he didn't, I wish I had. He said, "It is just as easy to pool ignorance as it is to pool intelligence." I think we have "pooled" the latter here. Thank you very much!

# AN ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC VARIABLES IN MANPOWER AND VOCATIONAL SKILL TRAINING PROGRAMS

---

## Final Report

July 1, 1973

---

Olympus Research Corporation
955 East Ninth South
Salt Lake City, Utah

Prepared for the Division of Manpower Development and Training of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under grant no. OEG-0-71-4777(335).

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED -- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the Division of Manpower Development and Training, like all other programs or activities receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with this law.

Opinions expressed in this document are those of the contractor and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

# SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT AND ITS FINDINGS

Despite a decade of fluctuating efforts to spread the full benefits of America's affluence and opportunities to various population groups suffering more than their share of deprivation, the critical question remains unanswered: When unemployment, underemployment and low incomes seem concentrated upon a particular group or individual, is the primary cause to be found in the shortcomings of those individuals or in the institutional structure of a society which denies them opportunity? If the cause is to be found in the individual -- lack of skills, lack of education, language deficiencies, undermotivation -- the operational response should be to change the individual. If the institutional structure is at fault -- discrimination, excessive credentialism, lack of information, transportation, etc. -- the answer is most likely to be found in changing institutions. Every remedy and every program must make some assumption about this dichotomy. If the assumption is incorrect, the solution chosen is unlikely to be successful.

In exploring for obstacles to economic success for various population groups, one obvious possibility is that cultural and language differences may pose serious obstacles. Those obstacles may be such as to make it difficult to function successfully in employment situations structured to fit the majority. The obstacles may merely deny one the opportunity to demonstrate performance because of employer bias or misconception. The obstacles may impede attainment of or performance on the job. Culture and language variables might also block the acquisition of skills necessary to obtain and perform on the job.

Seeking an assessment of the extent to which cultural and linguistic differences might prevent members of various minority groups from profiting from available manpower training programs, the Division of Manpower Development and Training in the U.S. Office of Education contracted with the Olympus Research Corporation for the project, of which this is the final report.

This project was initially a response to a problem that over the years has proved itself particularly resistant to solution: the consistently low level of success that members of minority groups have experienced as they move through the American educational establishment. There are those who argue that their chances of success could be improved if their educational program were carefully tailored to respond to the characteristics of their cultures which distinguish them from other cultural groups and from the mainstream of American life. Others argue that this very tailoring is discriminatory and that minority students and trainees should instead have experiences and opportunities identical to those that the majority have. Some minority spokesmen condemn both these positions as focusing on an insignificant problem -- these same culture and language variables -- and draining energy and attention away from the real source of the problem, which is not cultural at all, but rather the overall socioeconomic environment, the unrelenting pattern of deprivation that is the lot of so many members of America's racial and ethnic minorities.

The very fact that this problem arouses such controversy suggests that it is an important area for further exploration, and it is just such further exploration that is the task of this project. It is important to emphasize, however, the tentative nature of the project. The impact of cultural and language differences has been explored, but the controversy has not been laid to rest, and probably will not be by any formal research because it is fueled by the full range of human experience, by political, social, economic, psychological, philosophical, and even educational concerns. Nonetheless, this project has allowed the researchers to formulate some hypotheses about the role of culture and language in the manpower training experience of blacks, chicanos, native Americans, and Appalachian whites; and these hypotheses point to where new efforts can be more profitably focused.

## TERMINOLOGY

In order to make clear the description of this project and the rather complex concerns it addresses, it is helpful to define several of the terms which are used in the report:

(1) Culture: A body of customary beliefs and social forms and a related pattern of human behavior manifested in thought, speech, action, and artifact which combine to produce a distinct complex of characteristics that distinguish one population group from other groups

(2) Dominant culture: The culture (as defined above) manifested by the majority of the population in a given area, such as (for the purpose of this study) the United States

(3) Cultural and language variables: Those characteristics of attitude and behavior, use of languages other than English or use of nonstandard English, which are unique to a population group and help to distinguish it from other groups

(4) Minority group: A group comprised of a minority of the population of an area that is either distinct from the overall population due to cultural, language, or physical characteristics, or is separated from the overall population by attitudes of the dominant culture that assume such distinguishing characteristics

The population groups considered by this study are blacks (Afro-Americans), chicanos (Mexican-Americans), native Americans (Indians), and Appalachian whites.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objectives of the study were (1) to determine the extent to which cultural or language differences prevented members of the target groups from profiting from vocational education and manpower training and (2) to recommend remedies for any observed obstacles to successful training.

These objectives were approached through a series of distinct but related steps. First, an extensive review of the literature already produced about these variables was conducted. On the basis of this review, commonly held opinions about the variables in general and their effect on education in particular were gathered. From this information, a framework for further inquiry was devised, consisting primarily of a questionnaire/interview survey of administrative, support, and teaching staffs at manpower training centers. These personnel were asked to identify any cultural and language characteristics that they felt their trainees from a given minority shared and to assess the effect of those characteristics on trainee performance. An important and additional source of information was a variety of interviews with spokesmen of the different minorities studied, as well as three conferences organized by ORC -- one on chicano and another on black concerns and a third in which representative leaders from various minorities reviewed the draft report of the study.

## HYPOTHESES FORMULATED FROM THE STUDY

The findings of this study have been organized as a series of "hypotheses." The term normally suggests the setting up of an assertion which the study will then attempt to prove or disprove. However, this study is an earlier step in the process. It has explored the relevance and impact of cultural and language variables and then has documented the following findings, conclusions, and assertions which are deserving of further exploration and testing to determine the full implications of each of them on the training experiences of minority groups:

(1) Culture and language differences existing within various minority groups are often as pronounced as the differences among population groups, making it exceedingly difficult to reach generalizations about a given group that are sufficiently accurate to be a useful base for practicable recommendations. Nevertheless, there can be no analysis and no policy without generalization. It is necessary, therefore, to exercise care that

recommendations and policy actions address only those factors which are generalizable.

(2) No cultural attributes internal to and typical of the groups studied were discovered which posed general obstacles to the ability of trainees to learn and profit from vocational education and manpower training. However, misunderstandings by administrators and instructors about the nature and implications of their trainees' cultural backgrounds did occasionally impose obstacles to both teaching and learning.

(3) With blacks and Appalachian whites and many and probably most chicanos and native Americans, there are no language differences sufficient to create serious obstacles to the learning process in training programs. In all of these groups, English tends to be the dominant language. However, there are those in all of these groups who are inadequately skilled in English, and for them this deficiency is an obstacle. For many chicanos and native Americans, whose retention of their native language is generally more pronounced than in other groups, language tends to loom much larger as a significant factor in training.

That cultural differences pose no significant obstacles to the cognitive learning ability of minority group members, while language obstacles to learning exist only for those unable to understand and communicate in English without serious difficulty, does not mean that cultural and language differences cause no serious problems. Further examination of the data gathered in this study produces these additional hypotheses:

(1) Although it does not significantly interfere with a trainees' ability to learn, culture does function as a factor in various misunderstandings of minority trainees by instructors and other staff -- misunderstandings that can cause the teacher, and the learning environment he creates, to be ineffective. In other words, staff attitudes toward and perceptions of trainee characteristics are significantly greater obstacles to the learning process than are the characteristics themselves.

(2) The economic deprivation, the limitations on experience and opportunities, and the poverty-dominated social atmosphere shared in different forms by many members of the minorities encompassed by this study are much more likely to combine to create serious obstacles to successful training and well-developed vocational aspirations than are specific cultural and language variables.

(3) There are preferences for life-styles and location which dissuade some minority group members, particularly those from rural backgrounds, from taking full advantage of the economic opportunities provided by improved employability.

The implications of these last three hypotheses give rise to the final general hypothesis of the study: Any effective assessment of the educational problems of minority members in training programs is not complete unless it considers the social, economic, and political realities of the trainees' environment. Each of these hypotheses is discussed and supported in detail in chapter 8 of this report.

## HYPOTHESES ABOUT SPECIFIC MINORITY GROUPS

Behind the general hypotheses of the study are the specific hypotheses which were formulated about each of the groups studied. In the following discussions, these are spelled out in groups for further clarification.

### Blacks

There are no variables peculiar to blacks which pose significant obstacles to successful vocational training. Staff misconceptions that assume the existence of variables, which do not in fact exist, create an atmosphere of poor communications that hinders trainee performance and may also excessively limit the occupations to which trainees are assigned. Some blacks from rural backgrounds and central city ghettos do use nonstandard English which may cause them to be resented by training staffs and avoided by employers. Their ability to understand and communicate and learn is not impeded, but they do contribute to discrimination against themselves.

Most if not all of the factors which seem to affect the general performance of blacks in training programs are the result of past and present discrimination and the socioeconomic deprivation many of them have experienced in such areas as income, education, and housing. Blacks are particularly likely to reject training opportunities in what they perceive from a background of discrimination to be demeaning occupations.

### Chicanos

Those of Spanish background in the United States include descendants of the original inhabitants of the American Southwest with whom the Spanish conquistadores intermarried, immigrants from Spain, Mexico, other Latin-American countries, Cuba, and Puerto Rico and their descendants. The interviewees for this study were primarily located to the Southwest and excluded Cubans and Puerto Ricans and involved few Latin-

American immigrants from countries other than Mexico. The term "chicano" is used to encompass this heterogeneous group. The geographic, economic, and attudinal heterogeneity of the chicano population makes it particularly difficult to generalize about the influence of their culture, on their success in training, and on their vocational aspirations. Chicano spokesmen, nonetheless, strongly express a desire to develop, maintain, and utilize a sense of cultural identity.

Evidence from this study indicates that the extended family of the chicanos and the life-style and responsibilities that grow from it constitute a cultural characteristic that has a positive effect on the success of chicano trainees. Although the degree to which it exists is not clear, some chicanos are deficient in English language skills, and for them this lack presents a serious barrier to successful training. The ambiguous attitude of training staffs about possible solutions to this problem serve to aggravate the situation.

Several characteristics of the chicano population commonly described as culture based are, in fact, much more likely to be socioeconomically based:

(1) The allegedly negative influence that barrio life has on training success is in fact due to the qualities that barrio life shares with all economically deprived ghettos.

(2) The alleged preference of chicano workers for manual labor is in fact not a preference, but a choice forced upon them by the labor market and other socioeconomic forces that restrict their upward mobility.

(3) The alleged inability of the chicano to be motivated by anything other than immediate gratification (where it exists at all) is a reflection of

> the poverty-based experience chicanos share with other minorities which makes any long-range planning a luxury.

The stereotype of the chicano as unable to make a serious commitment to a time-structured situation -- the "mañana syndrome" -- is not apparent among these trainees.

## Native Americans

It is even more difficult to generalize about native American culture and language. The language of one tribe is often different from another, and few traits are widely shared among tribes. Language problems are a barrier to successful training and employment for many native Americans.

There are no cultural attributes which by themselves interfere with their ability to learn in training programs. However, many instructors fail to understand, or even to perceive, cultural attributes which are relevant to the learning situation. It is this lack of awareness that often results in teaching that is so ineffective that it jeopardizes the success of students subjected to it.

Two factors that contribute greatly to separating many native Americans from the mainstream of U.S. experience are the poverty and rural isolation that have consistently been the lot of so many. Although it is impossible to fully isolate the effect of poverty and isolation from the effect of culture, there is evidence to show that poverty and isolation are more likely to be the cause of some educational problems for native Americans than are cultural variables.

## Appalachian Whites

Cultural and linguistic differences do not significantly affect the training performance of Appalachian white trainees. The rural style of residence and life, close family ties, and the Appalachian dialect are identifiable characteristics in the lives of Appalachian white trainees. However, the first is a socioeconomically derived factor, and the study produced no clear-cut relationship between the other two and the level of trainee performance.

Training staff perceive a strong preference for training in manual skills among Appalachian trainees, but this seems more likely to be a response to economic and geographic realities than a cultural characteristic. Whatever differences exist (if any) between the performance of Appalachian trainees and some supposed national norm are the result not of culture or language, but of their economic environment.

END